



PLANT RESPONSES TO ATMOSPHERIC CO₂ ENRICHMENT WITH EMPHASIS ON ROOTS AND THE RHIZOSPHERE

Hugo H. Rogers, G. Brett Runion

National Soil Dynamics Laboratory, ARS-USDA, PO Box 3439, Auburn, Alabama 36831, USA

&

Sagar V. Krupa

Department of Plant Pathology, University of Minnesota, St Paul, Minnesota 55108, USA

Abstract

Empirical records provide incontestable evidence of global changes; foremost among these changes is the rising concentration of CO₂ in the earth's atmosphere. Plant growth is nearly always stimulated by elevation of CO₂. Photosynthesis increases, more plant biomass accumulates per unit of water consumed, and economic yield is enhanced. The profitable use of supplemental CO₂ over years of greenhouse practice points to the value of CO₂ for plant production. Plant responses to CO₂ are known to interact with other environmental factors, e.g. light, temperature, soil water, and humidity. Important stresses including drought, temperature, salinity, and air pollution have been shown to be ameliorated when CO₂ levels are elevated. In the agricultural context, the growing season has been shortened for some crops with the application of more CO₂; less water use has generally, but not always, been observed and is under further study; experimental studies have shown that economic yield for most crops increases by about 33% for a doubling of ambient CO₂ concentration. However, there are some reports of negligible or negative effects. Plant species respond differently to CO₂ enrichment, therefore, clearly competitive shifts within natural communities could occur. Though of less importance in managed agro-ecosystems, competition between crops and weeds could also be altered. Tissue composition can vary as CO₂ increases (e.g. higher C:N ratios) leading to changes in herbivory, but tests of crop products (consumed by man) from elevated CO₂ experiments have generally not revealed significant differences in their quality. However, any CO₂-induced change in plant chemical or structural make-up could lead to alterations in the plant's interaction with any number of environmental factors—physicochemical or biological. Host–pathogen relationships, defense against physical stressors, and the capacity to overcome resource shortages could be impacted by rises in CO₂. Root biomass is known to increase but, with few exceptions, detailed studies of root growth and function are lacking.

Potential enhancement of root growth could translate into greater rhizodeposition, which, in turn, could lead to shifts in the rhizosphere itself. Some of the direct effects of CO₂ on vegetation have been reasonably well-studied, but for others work has been inadequate. Among these neglected areas are plant roots and the rhizosphere. Therefore, experiments on root and rhizosphere response in plants grown in CO₂-enriched atmospheres will be reviewed and, where possible, collectively integrated. To this will be added data which have recently been collected by us. Having looked at the available data base, we will offer a series of hypotheses which we consider as priority targets for future research.

Keywords: global change, carbon dioxide, plants, roots, rhizosphere.

INTRODUCTION

The greatest experiment on earth has begun. We are changing the parameters that drive the planet's living systems. Among these is atmospheric CO₂ which emanates from our fire-driven economy. Carbon dioxide is the first molecular link from atmosphere to biosphere. It is essential for photosynthesis which sustains plant life, the basis of the entire food chain. No substance is more pivotal for ecosystems, either natural or managed.

The concentration of CO₂ was 270 ppm before the Industrial Revolution and has risen continuously to more than 355 ppm today. The trajectory of the change in atmospheric CO₂ concentrations, so clearly tracked by C. D. Keeling, is expected to double during the last half of the next century (Bolin *et al.*, 1986). Figure 1 shows the trace of the atmospheric CO₂ concentrations over the past three decades (Keeling *et al.*, 1989). The ever increasing magnitude is the most apparent feature. The recurring saw-toothed pattern is thought to reflect the seasonal cycle of the growth of vegetation in the Northern Hemisphere (Bacastow *et al.*, 1985). In fact, Keeling (1983) has postulated that the observed amplitude increase may be due to the stimulation of terrestrial plant activity. Modelling efforts by Kohlmaier *et al.*




Fig. 1. Original CO₂ concentration data of Keeling *et al.* (1989) including Keeling's latest measurements (Boden *et al.*, 1991) from Mauna Loa Observatory, Hawaii.

(1987, 1989) have suggested that a CO₂ fertilization effect associated with land biota is likely to explain around 25% (range: 8–64%) of the integral amplitude rise in the CO₂ signal from 1958 to 1988. A recent article by Tans *et al.* (1990) lends further credence to the idea of terrestrial ecosystems as sinks for large amounts of CO₂; differences between empirically observed atmospheric levels of CO₂ and surface ocean water partial pressures of CO₂ of the Northern Hemisphere were too small for oceans to be the major sink. These studies point to the inextricable linkage between vegetation and atmosphere.

As a result of the accumulation of CO₂ and other radiatively active trace gases in the troposphere, shifts in climate (temperature and precipitation patterns) have been predicted. Regardless of whether climatic changes take place, plants will be directly affected by the higher CO₂ concentration. Virtually all studies to date have shown enhanced crop growth, alleviation of some types of stress, and substantial increases in yield by elevated CO₂ levels. However, since individual species respond differently, competitive shifts might lead to alterations in the composition, structure, and function of natural plant communities.

Recent reviews integrate and interpret the CO₂ effects literature base (Krupa & Kickert, 1989; Bazzaz, 1990; Kimball *et al.*, 1990; Allen, 1993; Poorter, 1993; Rogers & Dahlman, 1993). Wittwer (1985) has written an excellent historical perspective on the benefits of CO₂ enrichment to plant productivity. Dahlman (1993) has provided a 10-year summary of CO₂-plant effects research. Drake *et al.* (1985) have critically evaluated methods for exposing plants to CO₂. Available field techniques for CO₂ experimentation have recently been described by Strain (1991). Much of our data base has been derived from controlled growth chamber and greenhouse studies; over the past few years assessments have been made with open top chambers in the field, and now FACE (free-air CO₂ enrichment) systems are beginning to come on line (Allen *et al.*, 1993). New stable isotope tracing methodology (Leavitt *et al.*, 1993) and novel approaches such as nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) imaging (Bottomley *et al.*, 1993) are

starting to be used in CO₂ effects work (Rogers & Bottomley, 1987; Rundel *et al.*, 1989). Both these approaches are highly effective since they are non-invasive and may be used *in situ*. Another progressing front is the development of plant/environment simulation models so essential to the efficient use of existing knowledge. Models are indispensable as tools for understanding complex response phenomena and for reliably predicting vegetation reactions to changing conditions.

Here we provide a short overview of the influence of more CO₂ on plants with emphasis on belowground aspects, namely roots and the rhizosphere. First, plant responses—structural and physiological—and their associated interactions will be discussed. We briefly outline the current state-of-knowledge on CO₂ effects, along with a short series of important but unanswered questions. Then published reports of the effects of aerial CO₂ enrichment on root development will be reviewed in detail. The few available studies on the rhizosphere in relation to CO₂-induced changes in plant growth will be presented. Finally, specific targets for future research on belowground processes will be proposed.

STRUCTURE

The effects of CO₂ on plant structure are many. In their study of leaf ultrastructure, Cave *et al.* (1981) reported the accumulation of large starch grains in the chloroplasts of clover.† Vu *et al.* (1989) observed similar starch deposits in soybean, but no appreciable alteration of chloroplast structure. The expanse and thickness of leaves increase (Apel, 1989). Observations of soybean leaf cross sections have revealed three layers of palisade cells for CO₂-enriched treatments (up to 910 ppm) rather than two as under ambient (340 ppm) CO₂ (Thomas & Harvey, 1983). Shifts in stomatal density have also been seen. Thomas & Harvey (1983) saw no significant influence of CO₂ on the stomatal indices of corn, soybean, or sweetgum. Woodward (1987), in an examination of herbarium leaf specimens of eight temperate arboreal species collected over the last 200 years, observed a 40% decrease in stomatal density. Experimental studies within the CO₂ concentration range of 225–340 ppm were consistent with this finding (Woodward & Bazzaz, 1988). However, Apel (1989) in a comparison of nine species grown at either 345 or 1500 ppm reported a significant increase in stomatal density; a large difference in response was observed among 12 French bean cultivars, with an average rise of 36%. Increasing CO₂ leads to a rise in stomatal density of rice leaves, largely as a result of more stomata per row, although on the abaxial surface also more rows across the leaf (Rowland-Bamford *et al.*, 1990). Perhaps this differential response across studies is species dependent or related to experimental

† For the Latin names of various plant species, the reader is referred to the Appendix.

conditions, such as exposure to sudden elevations of various CO₂ concentrations.

Individual plant organs have often been observed to enlarge proportionally with added CO₂. Significantly higher leaf areas have been recorded (Rogers *et al.*, 1983a; Gifford, 1988). Lengths of stems and number of nodes increase (Allen *et al.*, 1990a). Enhanced numbers of specific parts (stems, branches, tillers, and flowers) are common. For soybean, emergence and expansion rates of main stem leaves increase at high CO₂ (Cure *et al.*, 1989). Reproductive structures (which are often the marketable product) may increase in size or number (Acock & Allen, 1985).

A so-called 'luxury consumption' of carbon can occur when extra CO₂ from the air is available. This can translate into plant parts with higher densities than might actually be required (Acock & Allen, 1985). This can also lead to taller, denser canopies and greater root length densities. Such changes may enhance the plant's capacity to harvest light, water, and nutrients. Practically speaking, this capacity to gather raw materials can become crucial over the cropping cycle or within the life of natural communities.

ENERGETICS

Figure 2 provides a schematic representation of energy producing and energy consuming metabolic processes in plants. At the photosynthesis level, there are three main plant groups, so-called C₃, C₄, and CAM (Crassulacean acid metabolism) plants. Three and four refer to the number of carbon atoms in the first molecules formed at the end of the initial CO₂ fixation pathway. Soybean, wheat, rice, and potato are examples of C₃ plants. The C₄ pathway is found in tropical grass crops like corn, sugarcane, sorghum and some members of the families Chenopodiaceae and Amaranthaceae. The C₄ type metabolism is almost never found in woody species. The C₄ plants are more efficient in photosynthesis than the C₃ plants. In C₃ plants, 20–50% of the carbon fixed is immediately lost by photorespiration. In contrast C₄ plants exhibit little photorespiration. In comparison to these two types, the CAM plants are a form of C₄ except that CO₂ is fixed at night and then processed via a C₃ pathway during the day. CAM plants include such species as pineapple and succulent

vegetation like cacti and stonecrops (e.g. *Sedum*); they are highly efficient users of water.

The photoassimilated carbon and the generated energy are utilized toward biosynthesis. A portion of such biosynthesis constitutes the maintenance costs for the plant. In addition, plants must also expend energy when required for stress compensation or repair. In the end, the observed biomass yield is due to: [[any stress effect] – [repair]] + [maintenance]. If stress exceeds repair, (excluding the normal maintenance costs) then there will be an adverse effect on yield. To the contrary, if repair exceeds stress, there will be no adverse effects. Elevated CO₂ concentrations essentially act as stimuli facilitating biosynthesis to exceed the maintenance and any stress repair costs, leading to higher plant biomass.

PHOTOSYNTHESIS

High levels of CO₂ stimulate photosynthesis, particularly in C₃ plants. This is caused by the higher CO₂ *per se*, since both CO₂ and O₂ compete for the same site on the catalyzing enzyme rubisco (ribulose-1,5-bisphosphate carboxylase) (Goudriaan *et al.*, 1990). The C₄ types are much less affected since photorespiration is already suppressed by a CO₂-concentrating mechanism (Poorter, 1993). Figure 3 illustrates the classic C₃ and C₄ photosynthetic responses. The C₄ are quickly saturated as CO₂ concentration rises, while in the C₃ species photosynthetic responses continue to rise across a range extending over several hundred ppm CO₂. Limited data on CAM plants (their stomata close during the day) suggest that nocturnal enrichment of CO₂ would be beneficial (Black, 1986). A substantial amount of work has focused on net photosynthesis at higher concentrations of CO₂ (Huber *et al.*, 1984a,b; Gifford & Morison, 1985; Radin *et al.*, 1987; Allen *et al.*, 1990b; Besford *et al.*, 1990). Critical reviews of this topic have recently been published (Bowes, 1991; Long & Drake, 1992).




Fig. 3. Classical net photosynthetic curves for C₃ and C₄ species (Taiz & Zeiger, 1991). Dashed vertical lines at 350 and 700 μL/litre mark the current CO₂ level and the doubled concentration predicted to be reached sometime late in the next century (Houghton *et al.*, 1990). Arrows indicate incremental rise in net photosynthesis due to the CO₂ doubling (Kimball *et al.*, 1993).




Fig. 2. Energy producing and energy consuming metabolic processes in plants (modified from Kosuge and Kimpel (1981); reproduced by the kind permission © of the Cambridge University Press).

Despite well-known plant growth enhancements, the idea of photosynthetic acclimation leading to little or no long term gain in growth has been repeatedly examined (Delucia *et al.*, 1985; Peet *et al.*, 1985; Sasek *et al.*, 1985; Tissue & Oechel, 1987; Sage *et al.*, 1989). The initial high level of photosynthesis that occurs when plants are first exposed to higher CO₂ levels may decline after a period of days or weeks. In his recent discussion, Drake (1992) pointed out that even in the most extreme cases, photosynthetic rate falls only to that of control plants under ambient concentrations, and that these are unusual instances. Most investigators, however, even when showing photosynthetic reductions, have observed that the rates of photosynthesis are sustained significantly above those expected under present day ambient CO₂ conditions. In general, the effect of elevated CO₂ on photosynthetic capacity is still uncertain. Considerations of sink activity (i.e. carbon partitioning among the various plant organs) may help interpret divergent findings (Cure *et al.*, 1987, 1991; Herold, 1980; Drake, 1992). In fact, recent studies have shown a strong correlation between pot size and photosynthetic capacity (Arp, 1991; Thomas & Strain, 1991). Such results suggest a need to carefully consider rooting volume in CO₂ response studies.

RESPIRATION

Although much research regarding the influence of CO₂ on growth and photosynthesis has been conducted, relatively little effort has been directed toward the influences of elevated CO₂ on plant respiration. Up to 50% of carbon fixed in C₃ plants may be lost due to respiration (Farrar, 1985; Amthor, 1989). Although few studies have attempted to determine the role of CO₂ on direct and indirect respiratory effects, CO₂ has been hypothesized to influence respiration in several ways. Higher levels of CO₂ tend to decrease specific leaf surface area (Ford & Thorne, 1967; Hurd, 1968; Clough & Peet, 1981; Garbutt *et al.*, 1990) which may be indicative of thick cell walls and greater carbon content. This may increase the energy cost of constructing foliage per unit area. Conversely, leaf protein and nitrogen content tend to decrease with increasing CO₂ (Cure *et al.*, 1988a). Proteins have a high construction cost and increased protein content is associated with increased maintenance costs due to turnover; therefore, total costs of tissue construction and maintenance may be decreased with CO₂. Carbon dioxide increases in the atmosphere tend to increase root growth more than aboveground growth (Wittwer, 1978; Prior *et al.*, 1993). Since respiration of roots is significantly greater than aboveground portions per unit dry weight (Farrar, 1981), a tendency to increase respiration on a whole plant basis would result from elevated atmospheric CO₂. It has also been hypothesized that, since respiration rates of fungi are higher than for vascular plants, increased mycorrhizal colonization of plant roots under elevated CO₂ may increase whole-plant respiration (Lamborg *et al.*, 1983). Elevated CO₂ may result in

greater activity of the cyanide resistant respiratory pathway that results in greater rates of respiration (Musgrave *et al.*, 1986). Respiration, particularly cyanide resistant respiration (Lambers, 1985), can increase as nonstructural carbohydrates increase. Since additional CO₂ can increase the concentration of nonstructural carbohydrates (Amthor, 1988), another mechanism exists which could account for an effect of CO₂ on plant respiratory costs. The biochemical bases for respiratory responses to ethylene are unclear; however, ethylene is a strong promoter of respiration and CO₂ can affect ethylene biosynthesis (Amthor, 1991).

A reduction in dark respiration by elevated CO₂ has been found for several species. Both short-term and long-term responses have been reported. Gifford *et al.* (1985) demonstrated that high CO₂-induced suppression of dark respiration led to higher dry weight in wheat. Similar findings were reported for alfalfa by Reuveni and Gale (1985). Bunce (1990) observed inhibition of respiratory CO₂ efflux with increased CO₂ in two C₃ species, tomato and soybean, and in one C₄ species, *Amaranthus*. Reduced respiration has been seen in the field for three herbaceous perennial species, orchard grass, perennial rye grass, and alfalfa (Bunce & Caulfield, 1990). A doubling of CO₂ inhibited respiration of curly dock by 25–30%, while a decrease in CO₂ elicited a corresponding increase in respiration (Amthor, 1988). Implications of these phenomena for real world plant systems will have to await further research. Such findings may call for a redesign of some of the present day experimental protocols (e.g. elevation of CO₂ both day and night).

Ryan (1991) suggests that data on respiration are difficult to interpret because construction and maintenance respiration were rarely distinguished and respiration was related only to dry weight or surface area and not to nitrogen content. In particular, separating the effects on the functional components of respiration (i.e. construction, maintenance and ion uptake) as well as carbon costs due to root exudation are needed. These gaps in our knowledge hamper the development of adequate models that assess the response of plant respiration to CO₂ and represent major uncertainties as to the effects of CO₂ on the carbon cycle.

WATER USE

At the cellular level, elevated CO₂ slows transpiration rate by inducing the partial closure of guard cells that form stomates on leaf surfaces (Jones & Mansfield, 1970). This contributes to an increase in water use efficiency (WUE, the ratio of carbon fixed to water transpired). Physiologically, WUE increase represents one of the most significant plant responses identified thus far, to excess CO₂. Both the suppressed use of water and the rise in photosynthetic rate go toward pushing this important ratio upwards. Relative percentage contributions of the two processes in the C₄ species corn is 27:73 (net photosynthesis:transpiration rate) while in the C₃ plant soybean, it is 90:10 (Acock &




Fig. 4. Water use efficiencies for corn and soybean over a range of CO₂ concentrations. Values were fitted by the method of least squares regression and are based on 50 observations for corn and 46 for soybean, both grown at 340, 520, 718 and 910 ppm.

Allen, 1985). In the C₄ plant, the transpiration component is far more important than in the C₃. Figure 4 shows WUE for field-grown corn and soybean over a range of CO₂ concentrations (Rogers *et al.*, 1983b). That WUE is increased by CO₂ enrichment has often been reported (Sionit *et al.*, 1984; Morison, 1985; Baker *et al.*, 1990c); however, discrepancy does exist. Some reports indicate that larger plant size (leaf area) counterbalances the reduction in water use, offsetting enhanced WUE (Allen, 1993). Data shown in Fig. 5 indicate that WUE is highest with elevated CO₂ and low LAI (leaf area index), while the lower CO₂ level and high LAI resulted in the lowest WUE. Others suggest that the landscape's response is not adequately reflected by studies of small numbers of plants in artificial enclosures. Rosenberg *et al.* (1990) have examined the




Fig. 5. Whole day water use efficiencies (WUE) of soybean canopies grown at a daytime dry bulb air temperature of 31°C and a dewpoint temperature of 21°C. Low leaf area index (LAI) was 3.3 and high was 6.0 (Jones *et al.*, 1985).

potential effects of climate and CO₂ enrichment on evapotranspiration. At least one recently completed simulation, which included climate change, found that under certain conditions a decrease in evapotranspiration could be expected (Kuchment & Startseva, 1991), while another (Curry *et al.*, 1990) predicted a rise in plant water needs. By and large, most studies have reported enhancements. In their comprehensive treatment of the topic, Kimball and Idso (1983) cited 46 observations which cumulatively showed that transpiration would be lowered by an average of 34% which, coupled with an economic yield enhancement of 33% (over 500 observations), suggested a doubling of water use efficiency for a doubling of CO₂ level.

No in-situ, non-invasive field studies of CO₂ effects on plant water use have been published to date. In the field, water availability will depend upon rainfall distribution, leaf and canopy structure, extent and depth of rooting, and the various weather variables. For an accurate assessment, field tests of indigenous species unencumbered by experimental equipment (i.e. micrometeorology must be normal) will have to be performed.

INTERACTIONS WITH OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

Virtually any factor that affects plant growth can influence its reaction to elevated CO₂ (Fig. 6). From a different vantage point, it is also known that CO₂ can ameliorate certain environmental stresses. The role of CO₂ as a chief input to plant life may become especially significant in view of predicted future climate effects on vegetation (Bolin *et al.*, 1986; Idso, 1989). Water, temperature, light, nutrients, salinity, and air pollutants have all been observed to interact with CO₂-induced responses. In addition, biological interactions with crops have been seen in the form of altered weed competition




Fig. 6. Climatic and soil factors (biotic and abiotic) affecting activity of the root system (modified from Dommergues, 1978).

and insect pests relationships. Microorganisms, including diseases, associated with plants could also be affected.

Water stress has been repeatedly observed to be ameliorated by increased concentrations of CO₂ (Gifford, 1979; Sionit *et al.*, 1980, 1981d; Morison & Gifford, 1984a,b; Schonfeld *et al.*, 1989). We have observed this with soybean (Rogers *et al.*, 1984; Prior *et al.*, 1991). Figure 7 shows architectural diagrams of soybean plants grown at three CO₂ levels under both well-watered and water-stressed conditions in our laboratory (Prior, 1986). Growth enhancement by CO₂ and a water stress compensating effect may be readily noted. Reports that this stress is decreased in other plant species are not uncommon (Wong, 1980; Lemon, 1983; Acock & Allen, 1985; Goudriaan & Bijlsma, 1987; Nijs *et al.*, 1989). By inducing the partial closure of stomates, water is conserved. To date the role of plant roots, the primary extractors of soil water, has not been elucidated in the present context. This phenomenon of protection from water stress could help alleviate negative impacts of drier future climates.

Baker and Allen (1992) substantiated a high degree of temperature dependence in soybean growth response to elevated CO₂. Jones *et al.* (1985) have provided response curves for photosynthesis and transpiration under various levels of both CO₂ and temperature. Idso *et al.* (1987) reported results suggesting that for a 3°C rise in mean surface air temperature plant growth enhancement would increase from 30 to 56%. Their results also showed that at cooler temperatures (<18.5°C, daily mean) elevated CO₂ tended to reduce plant growth. The authors aptly pointed out that this temperature dependence would make the prediction of CO₂ response far more complex than first thought. Both

Potvin (1985) and Sionit *et al.* (1981b) saw alleviation of chilling effects by CO₂ enrichment. Potvin observed a buffering of physiological shifts due to cold, whereas Sionit *et al.* saw an elevated CO₂ compensation for chilling in the garden vegetable okra. The life cycle of the plant could be completed at a temperature several degrees lower with added CO₂. Overall, interaction of CO₂ and temperature is not well understood; there is some conflict in the experimental data base.

Light and CO₂ have long been known to interact; both affect the plant through the photosynthetic process. Brun and Cooper (1967) have provided a full spectrum of light and CO₂ interactions with soybean leaves. They found that after maximum net photosynthesis was reached, it declined if either light level or CO₂ concentration was lowered. Sionit *et al.* (1982) reported similar findings for soybean, radish, sugar beet, and corn; total dry matter production was highest at the highest values of CO₂ and light tested. It has been concluded that, at least in part, elevated CO₂ can compensate for reduced light (Hurd, 1968; Acock & Allen, 1985; Mortensen & Ulsaker, 1985).

Positive plant response to CO₂ appears to occur under a wide range of nutrient availability (Sionit *et al.*, 1981a; Sionit, 1983; Cure *et al.*, 1988a,b). Studies (with soybean, corn, rice, cotton, wheat, and a few weed species) have, however, demonstrated diminished growth responses due to nitrogen limitation (Goudriaan & de Ruiter, 1983; Cure *et al.*, 1988a). One study has shown this with several plant types over a range of dilutions of a complete nutrient solution (Patterson & Flint, 1982); that is, with increasing nutrient availability, the CO₂ stimulation response appears to grow larger.




Fig. 7. Plant architectural diagrams of well-watered (WW, rewatered at -0.010 ± 0.005 MPa) and water-stressed (WS, rewatered at -0.080 ± 0.0045 MPa) soybean indicating mean morphological data during late pod fill stage of growth for plants grown at CO₂ concentrations of 349, 645 and 946 ppm. Diagonal lines represent sum of lateral branch lengths at each node; short perpendicular lines are leaves; dots equal two pods; replicate number per treatment was six; and scale mark is 10 cm (Prior, 1986).

Relief from the effects of salinity has been seen in some studies (Schwarz & Gale, 1984; Bowman & Strain, 1987). In other words, salt tolerance increases as CO₂ concentration goes up (Zeroni & Gale, 1989). There are two possible explanations. Extra supplies of photosynthate may help to offset increased respiration demands. Less water throughout in the transpiration stream (rate lowered by extra CO₂) could lessen the quantity of salt taken up (Acock & Allen, 1985).

The narrowing of stomates by increased levels of CO₂ immediately infers the possibility of protection from air pollutants that enter leaves by this route. In fact this has been experimentally demonstrated, and briefly discussed by Morison (1988). A few investigators have shown a lessening of injury by O₃, SO₂, NO, and NO₂ on several common crops (Hou *et al.*, 1977; Carlson & Bazzaz, 1982; Reddy *et al.*, 1989b; Allen, 1990). Allen's recently published review (1990) of the topic revealed a paucity of data and concluded further studies were needed.

Weeds are important since they suppress crops in a variety of ways by competing for vital resources. The differential responses of plant species to rising CO₂ suggest that relative competitiveness may be altered. This has been found to be the case. Studies by Patterson and Flint (1990) have shown that weeds with the C₃ pathway would probably outcompete C₄ crops but that C₄ weeds would be less competitive against C₃ crops. Other studies have substantiated this finding (Patterson *et al.*, 1988; Sasek & Strain, 1989). Zangerl and Bazzaz (1984) have noted an unusually high stimulation of growth in the common C₄ weed *Amaranthus*. Potential shifts in weed growth will be important in terms of farm practice and economics.

The interaction of high CO₂ and plant insect pests has been shown (Osbrink *et al.*, 1987; Fajer *et al.*, 1989). Lincoln *et al.* (1984) showed that insect (butterfly larvae) feeding rates rose as CO₂ in the plant growth atmosphere was increased. This was related to the nitrogen and water content of soybean leaves. More recent studies have suggested that leaf-feeding caterpillars do not do as well on plants grown at high CO₂, presumably due to increased carbon:nitrogen ratio (nutritive value lower) (Akey & Kimball, 1989).

Surfaces of plant parts which attract and interact with microorganisms can be expected to change as CO₂ changes the quantity and quality of metabolic products that go to form surface constituents. The manner in which increases in atmospheric CO₂ affect the major diseases of the world's crops may result in positive or negative impacts on crop health and productivity. Generalities regarding effects of CO₂ on host-pathogen interactions can be theorized using knowledge of eco-physiological differences among pathosystems. Elevated CO₂ generally promotes plant growth and, as plant structure is modified, the affected plants may sustain a higher level of infection without reduction in yield. Plants which are more vigorous are able to resist infection from weak pathogens, such as facultative parasites, resulting in lower disease incidence and

severity. However, larger plants provide more surface area for infection, and diseases (particularly those caused by obligate parasites) may increase in incidence and severity.

Elevated CO₂ may benefit plant health and productivity by altering the morphology and physiology of plants to the detriment of pathogenic microbes. Growth of soybean at enriched CO₂ concentrations has resulted in the increased deposition of epicuticular wax on leaves and extra layers of epidermal cells (Thomas & Harvey, 1983); this could have important implications for phylloplane dwelling organisms, including pathogens. Lower concentrations of nitrogen, altered C:N ratios, and production of more defense related compounds such as phenolics (Mellilo, 1983) may also lead to lower levels of foliar disease. However, starch and sugar content of plant leaves also have been shown to increase under elevated CO₂ (Yelle *et al.*, 1989), which may provide pathogenic microbes additional substrate for increased growth and reproduction. Thompson (1990) related lower powdery mildew (*Erysiphe graminis*) infection of wheat seedlings under elevated CO₂ to reductions in leaf nitrogen; he also reported that the effects of CO₂ on this pathosystem were influenced by the water status of the wheat seedlings. Thompson and Drake (1993) related lower severity of a foliar rust disease of a C₃ sedge under elevated CO₂ to reductions in leaf nitrogen content, but attributed an increase in foliar disease severity (fungus unknown) under elevated CO₂ for a C₄ grass to increased leaf water content. Runion *et al.* (1993) found that populations of various fungi on cotton leaves were differentially affected by elevated CO₂, but no appreciable effect of CO₂ on phylloplane bacteria or actinomycete populations was observed.

Changes in atmospheric CO₂ will elicit complex changes in plant-microbe interactions (Idso, 1990). Plant diseases will vary depending upon the host, the microorganism, and the environmental factors, all of which may be altered by an elevated CO₂ atmosphere. However, little is known to date concerning the role of CO₂ in this vital aspect of plant health.

AGRO-ECOSYSTEMS

Major world crops have been researched to varying degrees with respect to CO₂ effects (Cure & Acock, 1986; Enoch & Zieslin, 1988; Warrick, 1988; Kimball *et al.*, 1989; Newman, 1989; Smith & Tirpak, 1989; Enoch, 1990). A brief summary of known direct effects of elevated CO₂ on crops is given in Table 1, and an overview of possible interactions with other environmental variables in Table 2. Table 3 presents some key unresolved issues. The contents of these tables are based on interpretation of the literature base by Rogers *et al.* (1992a).

Faster growth and earlier maturity of crops are possible consequences of rising CO₂. Acceleration of development and a shortening of total growth duration have been recorded for rice (Baker *et al.*, 1990b).

Table 1. Direct effects of elevated CO₂ concentrations on crops: A general summary of what is known

Parameter	Effect	Comment
1 Photosynthesis and growth	Stimulation	In most cases
2 Photosynthetic capacity	Reduction	In a few cases in long-term exposures, under some conditions and not others
3 Stomatal conductance	Reduction	By ~40% at 2X present CO ₂ concentrations
4 Structure and physiology	Marked alteration	Larger plants, starch and sugar accumulation
5 Water use efficiency	Increase	~2X at 2X present CO ₂ concentrations
6 Water use per unit leaf area	Reduction	Significant at high CO ₂ . Reduced loss per unit land area due to larger leaf area
7 Foliar composition	Marked alteration	Increased C : N ratio under high CO ₂
8 Maturation rate	Increase	In many cases early flowering under high CO ₂
9 Biomass yield	Increase	By as much as 200% in young, widely spaced crops (e.g., citrus)
10 Economic yield	Increase	By ~33% in C ₃ plants (e.g., soybean, wheat, potato) and by ~10% in C ₄ plants (e.g., maize, sorghum, sugarcane) at 2X present CO ₂ concentrations

Mauney *et al.* (1993) found that cotton grown under free-air CO₂ enrichment attained maturity (with respect to economic yield) five weeks sooner than controls. Calvert (1972) reported earlier ripening of tomato. Our work with soybean at elevated CO₂ showed that physiological maturity was attained four days earlier and the general senescence that followed progressed even more rapidly (Rogers *et al.*, 1986). A decrease in the time to produce a crop would be of enormous importance in regions where growing seasons are already of marginal length or in areas where double cropping is practiced.

Economic yield, the bottom line of all farming, has been seen to increase. Kimball's (1983a,b) excellent compilations and analyses of hundreds of prior studies suggest an enhancement factor of 1.32 (99.9% confidence interval: 1.24–1.43) if ambient CO₂ were doubled. Virtually all authors dealing with direct effects of CO₂ have concluded that the impact on the yield of crops will be positive.

What of crop quality? A few investigators have examined this issue. In a study of sudan grass quality, Akin *et al.* (1993) found that enriching CO₂ concentration to 550 ppm in the open field did not reduce forage digestibility, and that CO₂-induced yield increases might be expected to produce biomass of equal bio-availability. Sweet potatoes grown at various enhanced CO₂ levels were identical based on consumer scores of sensory perception (Bhattacharya, 1993). In our work with soybean and corn over a CO₂ range from 340 to 910 ppm, no appreciable effects were observed for percentages of moisture, fat, protein, or crude fiber in

seeds (Rogers *et al.*, 1983a). Havelka *et al.* (1984) reported no change in the protein content of wheat grown at high CO₂ levels. While shoot nitrogen has generally been observed to decline, seed nitrogen content remains unchanged (Newton, 1991). Interactions between the level of plant nutrition and CO₂ have been suggested.

Increased atmospheric CO₂ is an important aspect of future agro-ecosystems. Farmers, growers, and producers of foods are expected to adjust their practices to best take advantage of this CO₂ subsidy. Based on current projections, there is every reason to believe that this will occur.

One example where agricultural and natural ecosystems meld is in the rangelands that are used for livestock grazing. Earlier this year, Owensby *et al.* (1993a,b) provided two papers discussing the first and only study of rangeland/grazing responses to elevated CO₂. In their reports, rangeland biomass was observed to increase with extra CO₂ but individual species response varied, suggesting that over time community composition might shift. The methodology needed to investigate grazing of CO₂-affected rangeland was developed. With rangelands occupying over 47% of the world's land area, such research is indeed important.

Forest systems form another continuum between natural and managed plant communities. Individual species have been studied, and increased biomass production under elevated CO₂ is generally observed (refer to Table 4, Forest Ecosystem Components for references). Eamus and Jarvis (1989) reported, with 60

Table 2. Effects of elevated CO₂ concentrations on crops: Possible interactions with other environmental variables

Interacting variable	Comment
1 Temperature	(a) Positive CO ₂ effect with rise in °C (b) More water required per unit land area with rise in °C (c) Flower and seed development decreased with rise in °C beyond the normal range of adaptation for each species. For tropical rice, seed yields linearly decrease 10% per °C from 26°C to 36°C regardless of the CO ₂ level
2 Drought, salinity, chilling	Reduction in stress response
3 Mineral stress	Reduction in response to elevated CO ₂
4 Air pollutants	Reduction in stress response
5 UV-B	Reduction in stress response
6 Insects	Qualitative and quantitative changes in herbivory. More foliage consumed
7 Pathogens	Marked alterations expected with the incidence of both foliar and root diseases, with rise in CO ₂ and °C

Table 3. Effects of elevated CO₂ concentrations on crops: Some unresolved issues

- 1 What are the nature and rates of adaptation of crop species to rising ambient CO₂ concentrations from the past to the present? How will these characteristics influence or modify the predictions of future responses to elevated CO₂ levels
- 2 Why do some C₃ crop species (e.g. soybean, potato, cotton) maintain or increase their photosynthetic capacity when exposed to long-term elevated CO₂ levels, while others (e.g. rice, cabbage, kidney bean) decrease their capacity? How will this impact crop production?
- 3 What is the basis for the large range of values for decreases in water use under elevated CO₂ levels? Are these differences related to the climate and/or the experimental regimes?
- 4 How should the genetic potential for the adaptation of various crop species (in monocultures and in mixtures as appropriate) to changing climate be assessed? What are the relationships between the present geographic ranges of various crop species and the corresponding variability in various growth limiting climate variables (both physical and chemical parameters)?

tree species, an average increase in biomass of 40% for a doubling of CO₂, which is very similar to the increase in yield reported for agronomic crops (Kimball, 1983a,b).

Differential responses to CO₂ enrichment among tree species have been observed (Williams *et al.*, 1986) and, thus, one result of rising levels of CO₂ might be to increase the competitive ability of certain tree species relative to others (Bazzaz *et al.*, 1990). Tolley and Strain (1984a) found that sweetgum seedling response to high CO₂ was much greater than for loblolly pine seedlings. They further reported that this differential response was enhanced under drought stress and proposed that a doubling of CO₂ would enable sweetgum to become established on drier sites currently dominated by loblolly pine. This differential response may serve to alter species composition and reduce diversity in forests. The impacts this differential response to CO₂ will have on forests will depend on site productivity (Pastor & Post, 1988), their current species composition (Williams *et al.*, 1986) and on their location along the natural to managed plant community continuum, i.e. natural, unmanaged forest ecosystems may be seriously impacted but alterations in species composition will have little or no effect for intensively managed, monoculture tree farms.

Shugart and Emanuel (1985) have underscored the uncertainty of forest response to the direct effects of increased CO₂. Extrapolation of data from past studies, which have generally been of relatively short duration using potted tree seedlings, to actual forest responses must be made with caution (Jarvis, 1989) and direct effects of excess CO₂ on forest themselves have not yet been studied. However, attempts to do so using a new exposure method, FACE (free-air CO₂ enrichment), are underway (Hendrey, 1992).

NATURAL PLANT COMMUNITIES

Natural ecosystems are critical components of the earth's biosphere and the effects of increasing levels of CO₂ on these communities have been considered (Strain & Cure, 1985, 1986; Mooney, 1991; Mooney *et al.*, 1991). Unmanaged plant systems in the wild have a high degree of diversity and complexity, confounding our understanding of their function. It is not surprising that much less is known about natural communities compared with cropping systems. Environmental interactions such as herbivory become all the more impor-

tant since there is no selective control by man. Strain (1987) has discussed the physiological and ecological aspects of plant response to elevated atmospheric CO₂. His argument, that if primary physiological shifts (in photosynthesis, respiration, and water use) occur, then higher level ecological alterations (in competition, plant-animal relationships, and biotic-abiotic interactions) will take place, is a good one.

In a report of experimental findings, Bazzaz *et al.* (1985) offer some key points concerning plant community response to elevated atmospheric CO₂: (1) differential response by species suggests alteration of competitive relationships, (2) reproductive changes may not follow biomass responses, so full life cycle studies are essential, (3) since flowering and fruiting can shift, some effects may require several generations to be fully realized, and (4) increased CO₂ may offer at least some protection against air pollutants.

Bazzaz (1990), in a major review, concluded that impacts on ecosystem productivity would result primarily from changes in species composition brought about by differential species response to elevated CO₂. Plant density, identity, and proximity, environmental resource availability and the influence of herbivores, pathogens, and symbionts have been found to play crucial roles in the way plants respond to CO₂ enrichment. Bazzaz points out, and rightfully so, that our sketchy knowledge of the highly complex interactions severely limits our prediction of community response to future conditions. In a later report, Bazzaz and Fajer (1992) argue very strongly that CO₂ may greatly alter ecosystem structure and function and that these changes will not necessarily benefit all plants.

In their paper on elevated CO₂ effects on natural plants and plant systems, Woodward *et al.* (1991) conclude that generalities may not be reached since there is a broad range of available experiments, but with differing conclusions and unexpected effects. They suggest that response studies be conducted at the community level with extrapolation back to the plant level rather than the reverse which is so much more difficult.

Wray and Strain (1987a) studied competition in old-field perennials at higher atmospheric CO₂ levels. Their results indicate that aster (C₃) becomes a more aggressive competitor against broomsedge (C₄). In a further study of age and competition with these same species it was suggested that future rises in CO₂ levels may decrease the rate of succession in old fields but not

necessarily eliminate competition from the community, with a definite potential, however, for shift in competition (Wray & Strain, 1987b).

As seen earlier, plant structure may be markedly altered. Shifts in overall form may be of much less consequence to crop production where the rule is monoculture than in natural ecosystems which are highly diverse. Natural interspecific competition is intense and is strongly influenced by canopy architecture, root distribution, and environmental conditions. Harsh stresses are common in these native plant communities, and any amelioration by rising CO₂ or other factors could become highly significant in shifting the competitive balance. In addition, stresses found in natural communities may lessen the impacts of CO₂. For instance, as nitrogen becomes more limiting, one may expect that the response to CO₂ would be dampened.

To a large extent, mechanistic CO₂ work has focused on the influence of variable CO₂ concentration on photosynthetic rates. However, unit leaf area rates of photosynthesis rarely correlate with increases in whole plant growth (Amthor, 1989). Whole plant growth is determined not only by net carbon assimilation per unit leaf area but also by the distribution of carbon among tissues (Norby *et al.*, 1992), the demography of plant organs (rates of birth and death), carbon costs of constructing tissues, and costs required to maintain these tissues. At the community level the distribution of carbon within tissues, particularly roots (e.g. secondary roots versus fine roots, shallow roots versus deep roots), exudation of carbon (see Rhizosphere) and associated feedback relationships, carbon:nitrogen ratio, leaf quality relative to herbivory, and the production of defense compounds may all affect higher order community interactions. Due to these interactions, the efficiency with which carbon gain, at the community level, per unit of resource (i.e. light, water, nutrients) acquired may not easily transcend scale. Instantaneous photosynthetic resource use efficiency may be largely irrelevant at higher organizational scales, yet our understanding and models, of plant communities in the past have in the main, if not exclusively, been predicated on this paradigm.

Different species respond differently to increasing CO₂. This is a chief concern with respect to natural plant community response (where competition governs composition) to global CO₂ rises. It is not so much an issue in crops, except for weeds which must be controlled.

ROOTS

During the past few decades approximately 1000 studies have examined the effects of CO₂ on plants (Kimball, 1983b), of which a small portion have included consideration of plant roots (Table 4). Root responses to CO₂ have been studied on a wide diversity of plant species; of the approximately 150 species studied, agronomic and natural community species comprise 30% each with forest species and horticultural crops each con-

tributing 20%. However, the majority (≈61%) of CO₂ studies containing root data have been conducted using agronomic crop plants. Many of the environmental factors discussed previously (i.e. water, temperature, light, nutrition, salinity, air pollutants, and competition) have been demonstrated to have significant interacting effects with CO₂ concentration on root responses for numerous species (Table 4). Variability in plant root response to interacting effects of CO₂ with other factors are primarily due to species variability as well as the levels of the treatment variables being researched.

The most frequently examined root response to elevated CO₂ has been dry weight which was examined in approximately 50% of the studies containing root data. Virtually all studies (≈87%) found that root dry weight increased under elevated atmospheric CO₂ regardless of species or study conditions (Table 4). Roots often exhibit the greatest relative dry weight increase among plant organs under high CO₂ (Wittwer, 1978; Rogers *et al.*, 1983a; Imai *et al.*, 1985; Norby *et al.*, 1992) or, similarly, an increase in biomass partitioning to roots (expressed as an increase in the percent dry matter in roots) is sometimes observed (Imai & Murata, 1976; Hocking & Meyer, 1991). This preferential biomass partitioning to roots should result in an increase in the *root to total shoot ratio* (R:TS) which was found to occur in ≈41% of the studies examining this response variable. However, results on R:TS have been highly variable (Table 4). Decreases in R:TS occurred in similar percentages (13–20%) of studies conducted with agronomic, forest and natural community species; this response variable was included in only one study with horticultural species. Increases in R:TS occurred more frequently for agronomic crops, particularly root and tuber crops (Idso *et al.*, 1988), and for more of the natural community species than for forest species, which tended to have no change in R:TS under elevated CO₂. There was also large variability in R:TS response among different species within a plant-type category probably due to differing experimental conditions among studies (i.e. duration and method of exposure, interacting treatment variables, etc.).

Recently we re-examined the data previously collected by Rogers *et al.* (1983a) on the dry matter partitioning in soybean (C₃) and corn (C₄) exposed for 11 weeks to elevated CO₂ concentrations. Figures 8 and 9 show our results expressed as the ratios of the percent increase in the dry weight of various plant organs at three levels of elevated CO₂, in comparison with plants grown in 340 ppm CO₂. The root (R) to total shoot (TS) ratio increased at all three elevated CO₂ concentrations in both plant species. However, the magnitude of such increase exhibited a curvilinear relationship in both cases, with the amount of increase declining from 520 ppm to 718 ppm and then, increasing again at 910 ppm CO₂. An opposite pattern was observed with the stem (S) to leaf (L) ratios in both plant species. In comparison with these observations, while in soybean the root (R) to stem (S) ratio exhibited a curvilinear relationship, in corn there was a progressive decline in

these ratios with increasing CO₂ concentrations. As the CO₂ levels increased from 340 ppm, progressively more dry matter was allocated to the stems, in comparison with the roots. While such differences in carbon allocation and dry matter partitioning between C₃ and C₄ plants may not be surprising, we are unable to explain the curvilinear relationship between the ratios of percent increase in the dry matter of various plant organs and changing CO₂ concentrations. Although our studies may represent the only example at the present time, the observed inflection point at ~700 ppm CO₂ (Figs 8 and 9) may be of great interest and requires confirmation and further investigation. The overall observations may have a role in differentially regulating the architecture of C₃ versus C₄ plants at different levels of elevated CO₂ and thus, leading to possibly differing outcomes in crop-weed competitions at different CO₂ levels when C₃ and C₄ plants are involved.

Root length and number were the most frequently examined variables for horticultural species and they were examined more frequently for these species (45 and 74% of studies, respectively) compared with plants in other categories (2–12%). A majority (61–100%) of studies found that increased CO₂ resulted in more and/or longer plant roots (Table 4) which may lead to increased penetration (Baker *et al.*, 1990a; Rogers *et al.*, 1992b) and/or spread (Idso & Kimball, 1991b, 1992). Increasing the concentration of CO₂ in greenhouse mist systems increased the percentage of cuttings which formed roots in numerous ornamental and floricultural species (Lin & Molnar, 1981; French, 1989). Elevated CO₂ during propagation has also increased root number and length of sweet potato (Bhattacharya *et al.*, 1985a).

In addition to the four primary root response variables (root dry weight, root to total shoot ratio, root length and root number), many other belowground responses of plants to elevated atmospheric CO₂ have received attention (Table 4). Studies on other structural

aspects of plant roots (i.e. diameter, volume, branching, relative growth rate, etc.) have usually shown positive effects of high CO₂. Tubers (number, dry weight, diameter, etc.) and nodulation (number, dry weight, activity, etc.) have also been demonstrated to benefit from elevated CO₂ in most cases.

Root function, in addition to structure, is also affected by increasing CO₂. In many species leaf turgor pressure increases and leaf water potential becomes less negative (see for example, Garbutt *et al.*, 1990) indicating an increase in water uptake by roots and/or an increase in water use efficiency. Water uptake on a whole plant basis has been shown to decline in one study with chrysanthemums (Gislerød & Nelson, 1989).

The concentration of nutrients in plant tissues is largely influenced by plant roots, as these are the primary means of extraction of nutrients for most plant species; therefore, effects of CO₂ on roots, and other belowground processes, will affect whole plant nutrition. Whole plant nutrient uptake is increased for many species under elevated CO₂ but the concentration of most nutrients on a per unit weight of tissue basis declines. Elevated atmospheric CO₂ usually increases the size of plants and their component parts, resulting in greater total amounts of nutrients, but these nutrients are distributed throughout the larger plants and thus, dilutes the concentration per unit weight. Also, nutrient utilization efficiency (unit of biomass produced per unit of nutrient) generally increases under elevated CO₂, while nutrient uptake efficiency (unit of nutrient per unit weight of root) declines in most studies. Again, under high CO₂, plants are able to produce more biomass with available nutrients but the larger root systems of these plants may not be able to gather additional nutrients in proportion to the increase in their root systems. The results on nutrient uptake and concentration are variable due to differences in nutritional levels applied during the course of the experiments. For




Fig 8. Ratios of percent increase in dry matter partitioning to leaves (L), stems (S), roots (R) and total shoot (TS) in the C₃ species soybean (11 weeks old) grown in open-top chambers at Raleigh, North Carolina; CO₂ concentrations were 340, 520, 718 and 910 ppm. Partitioning data were recalculated as a percentage of the dry weight of vegetative parts at 340 ppm at each elevated CO₂ level (Rogers *et al.*, 1983a).




Fig 9. Ratios of percent increase in dry matter partitioning to leaves (L), stems (S), roots (R) and total shoot (TS) in the C₄ species corn (11 weeks old) grown in open-top chambers at Raleigh, North Carolina; CO₂ concentrations were 340, 520, 718 and 910 ppm. Partitioning data were recalculated as a percentage of the dry weight of vegetative parts at 340 ppm at each elevated CO₂ level (Rogers *et al.*, 1983a).

example, when plants are grown under nutrient levels considered adequate or poor for ambient conditions, high CO₂ results in larger plants with lower tissue nutrient concentrations (Norby *et al.*, 1986a,b; Yelle *et al.*, 1987), but if plants growing under higher CO₂ are supplied with higher levels of nutrients, concentration of nutrients in tissues and/or nutrient uptake efficiency are generally not significantly affected by CO₂ concentration (Israel *et al.*, 1990).

Other response variables which have been infrequently examined include parenchyma cell division and expansion, mycorrhizae and carbohydrate concentrations in roots or tubers (Table 4). These response variables, as with the others discussed, increase under elevated atmospheric CO₂. Time to harvest has also been infrequently examined but was found to decrease for root and tuber crops (Cummings & Jones, 1918).

Table 4, while not necessarily a complete compilation, does contain a predominance of the available data concerning the effects of CO₂ on roots and below-ground processes. The one fact that is evident from the information in this table is that increasing levels of CO₂ in the earth's atmosphere will have virtually no adverse effects on plant root growth or function, and indeed will likely be positively affected in numerous ways which should benefit the health and productivity of most plant species.

Although Table 4 shows that many investigations on plant responses to elevated CO₂ have included effects on roots, the consideration these vital plant organs have received has been minor and often cursory; only 28% of the studies examined two or more of the four primary response variables and only 5% examined three or more of these variables. Acock and Allen (1985) in their review of 184 research reports found that, with the exception of a general increase in R:TS, there exists a serious lack of information regarding root growth response to high CO₂. The paucity of data on belowground processes has concerned several investigators and we will discuss the few, more detailed studies on crop roots and CO₂ enrichment which have recently begun to appear in the literature.

Stulen and den Hertog (1993) have recently completed a critical review of the available literature concerning effects of CO₂ on plant root growth and function. They discuss several experimental parameters which influence the response of roots to CO₂ (i.e. water, nutrients, pot size) and state that much of the variability in plant responses seen in the literature can be attributed to differential treatment of plants during the experiments, particularly in regard to R:TS. They conclude that, while more research on belowground plant growth and function is definitely required, the assumption that a larger proportion of the extra dry matter produced under CO₂ enrichment is allocated to roots needs critical reconsideration. This conclusion is supported by this review in that, while many studies have found an increase under elevated CO₂, R:TS was more variable in its response than were most of the other measurements examined (Table 4).

Del Castillo *et al.* (1989) tested the assumption that the extra root weight of high CO₂-grown soybean plants would enable them to explore a greater volume of soil. They found that root weight was 26–31% higher in CO₂ enriched chambers and that cumulative root length showed corresponding increases but CO₂ treatment did not affect the rate of root elongation. Instead, they found a significant linear increase in the number of actively growing roots with increased CO₂, i.e. the root systems of soybean plants growing under CO₂ enrichment were more branched than those growing in ambient air. They concluded that roots of soybean plants growing in high concentrations of CO₂ would not explore a greater volume of soil but would explore a given volume of soil more thoroughly. These findings contrast with those of Rogers *et al.* (1992b) who found a 110% increase in root length of soybean plants under high CO₂ with no change in the number of lateral roots.

Chaudhuri *et al.* (1990) found that winter wheat grown under elevated CO₂ achieved maximum rooting penetration significantly faster than plants grown in ambient air. They also found that differences in root growth between ambient and elevated CO₂-grown plants occurred in the first 10 cm of soil depth and concluded that high levels of CO₂ could compensate for restriction in growth of wheat roots by drought, particularly in the upper 10 cm of soil. In contrast to finding effects of CO₂ predominating in the upper 10 cm with wheat, Chaudhuri *et al.* (1986) found that numbers and dry weights of sorghum roots were higher at all soil-profile depths (to 150 cm) under elevated CO₂.

Masle *et al.* (1990) developed a theoretical framework of the growth and carbon economy of wheat seedlings as affected by soil resistance to penetration and ambient CO₂ concentration. They found that high soil resistance appeared to induce a factor which reduced shoot growth, reducing its sensitivity to carbohydrate substrates and thereby making more carbon available for the roots. However, they further report that, as seed reserves become limiting, growth becomes sensitive to the level of atmospheric CO₂ and that this response to CO₂ was seen mainly in the roots, indicating that root growth appeared to be suffering from a carbon limitation under ambient CO₂. They concluded that, if atmospheric CO₂ were not limiting, the adaptive advantage of allocating more carbon to the roots increases the chance for plants to overcome or recover from the difficulty of developing an inadequate rhizosphere in a soil of high mechanical resistance.

Laforge *et al.* (1991) found that raspberry plantlets rooted better under high levels of CO₂. They demonstrated that R:TS increased 88–113% and that resource allocation to the root systems, measured as percent dry weight in roots, increased 75%. However, the largest increases they observed were in dry weight (173–245% increase) and in root number (130–311% increase).

The authors are currently conducting detailed research on the effects of elevated atmospheric CO₂ on roots and below ground processes in crop plants. An

Table 4. Responses of plant roots to elevated CO₂

Species	[CO ₂] ppm	Location	RDW	Response R : TS RL	RN	Other	Interaction	Reference
Agro-Ecosystem Components: Agriculture								
<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i>	270, 350, 650	Phy	↑	—	—	Tissue [N] ↓	—	Overdieck <i>et al.</i> (1988)
<i>Arachis hypogaea</i>	450, 675, 1000	Phy	↑	↑	—	—	—	Sionit <i>et al.</i> (1981b)
	340, 1000	GC	↑	—	—	—	—	Chen & Sung (1990)
<i>Asparagus officinalis</i>	Amb, 1500	GC (Field)	—	—	—	Nodule DW — ↑	—	Havelka & Hardy (1976)
	330, 900, 1500	GH	↑	—	—	—	Light*	Desjardins <i>et al.</i> (1990)
<i>Beta vulgaris</i>	330, 1650, 3000	GC	↑	↑	—	Root fresh weight — ↑	Light	Laforge <i>et al.</i> (1991)
	300, 1000, 3300	GC	—	—	—	Root [sucrose] — ↑	—	Ford & Thorne (1967)
	Doubling	N/A	—	—	—	Root yield — ↑	—	Kimball (1983a)
	350, 675	Phy	—	↑	—	Root yield — ↑	—	Kimball (1983b)
	300, 1000	GC	↑	—	—	Root diameter — ↑	Light	Sionit <i>et al.</i> (1982)
						Parenchyma cell division — ↑	O ₂ *	Wyse (1980)
<i>Brassica napus</i>	340, 680	Phy	—	↑	—	—	—	Morison & Gifford (1984b)
<i>Brassica oleracea</i>	300, 1000, 3300	GC	—	NE	—	—	H ₂ O	Ford & Thorne (1967)
<i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>gongylodes</i>	300, 900	GC	↑	—	—	Tuber DW — ↑	H ₂ O	Srinathan & Lenz (1990)
<i>Citrus aurantium</i>	Amb, +300	OTC	↑	—	—	Tuber diameter — ↑	—	Idso & Kimball (1991a)
	Amb +300	OTC	↑	—	—	Root and tuber [N] — ↓	—	Idso & Kimball (1991b)
<i>Citrus paradisi</i> × <i>Poncirus trifoliata</i>	Amb, +300	OTC	↑	—	—	Distance from tree — ↑	—	Idso & Kimball (1992)
<i>Citrus sinensis</i>	330, 660	SPAR	↑	↓	—	Distance from tree — ↑	—	Koch <i>et al.</i> (1983)
<i>Citrus sinensis</i> × <i>Poncirus trifoliata</i>	400, 800	GC	NE	—	—	—	—	Downton <i>et al.</i> (1987)
	330, 660	SPAR	↑	↓	—	—	—	Koch <i>et al.</i> (1983)
<i>Cucumis sativus</i>	330, 660, 990	SPAR	↑	NE	—	—	—	Koch <i>et al.</i> (1987)
	Amb, 1300	GC	↑	↑	—	—	—	Ito (1972)
<i>Daucus carota</i> var. <i>sativus</i>	350, 1000	Phy	↑	↑	—	—	—	Peet (1986)
	340, 640	OTC	↑	↑	—	—	—	Idso <i>et al.</i> (1988)
<i>Echinochloa frumentacea</i>	320, 640	GH	↑	↑	—	—	Light*	Wong & Osmond (1991)
<i>Eleusine coracana</i>	Amb, 800	OTC	—	—	—	—	N*	Geethakumari & Shivashankar (1991)
	330, 900, 1500	GH	↑	—	—	N, P, K uptake — NE	—	Desjardins <i>et al.</i> (1987)
<i>Fragaria</i> × <i>ananasa</i>	330, 450, 600, 800	SPAR	↑	—	—	Root RGR — NE	Light	Allen <i>et al.</i> (1988)
	160-990	SPAR	↑	—	—	Root [N] — NE; Root NSC — ↑	—	Allen <i>et al.</i> (1991)
<i>Glycine max</i>	300, 600, 1200	GC in GH	↑	—	—	—	—	Carlson & Bazzaz (1980)
	350, 1000	Phy	↑	NE	—	—	—	Clough & Peet (1981)
	350, 700	Phy	↑	—	—	—	—	Cure <i>et al.</i> (1987)
	350, 700	Phy	↑	—	—	N uptake efficiency — ↓	N	Cure <i>et al.</i> (1988a)
						Total N — ↑, tissue [N] — ↓	—	—
						N utilization efficiency — ↑	—	—
						P uptake efficiency — ↓	—	—
						Total P — ↑, tissue [P] — ↓	—	—
						P utilization efficiency — ↑	—	—
						Branching — ↑	—	—
						Nodule DW — ↑	—	—
						Specific nodule activity — NE	—	—
						Total nodule activity — ↑	—	—
						—	Exposure*	—
<i>Eleusine coracana</i>	350, 700	Phy	↑	—	—	—	P*	Cure <i>et al.</i> (1988b)
<i>Fragaria</i> × <i>ananasa</i>	330, 450, 600, 800	SPAR	↑	—	—	—	—	Del Castillo <i>et al.</i> (1989)
	Amb, 1020	GC	↑	—	—	—	—	Finn & Brun (1982)

(continued)

Table 4—contd.

Species	[CO ₂] ppm	Location	Response				Other	Interaction	Reference
			RDW	R	TS	RL			
<i>Glycine max</i> (contd.)	Amb, 800	OTC	—	—	—	—	N, P, K uptake —↑	—	Geethakumari & Shivashankar (1991)
	Amb, 1000	OTC	—	—	—	—	N ₂ fixation —↑ Specific nodule activity —↑ Nodule fresh weight —↑ Total N —↑ Nitrate reductase activity —↓	—	Hardy & Havelka (1973)
	340, 640	OTC	—	NE	—	—	—	—	Idso <i>et al.</i> (1988)
	350, 700	Phy	↑	—	—	—	Total N and P uptake —↑ Total N and total P —NE N and P uptake efficiency —NE N and P utilization efficiency —↑	N, P	Israel <i>et al.</i> (1990)
	330, 450, 600, 800	SPAR	↑	—	—	—	—	—	Jones <i>et al.</i> (1984)
	350, 1000	GC	—	—	—	—	Nodule DW —↑ Total N —↑; tissue [N] —↓ Total nodule activity —↑	N	Masuda <i>et al.</i> (1989)
	350, 675	Phy	—	—	—	—	Root RWR —NE	H ₂ O	Patterson (1986)
	350, 600, 1000	GC	—	↑	—	—	—	—	Patterson & Flint (1980)
	350, 675	Phy	—	—	—	—	Root RWR —NE	Nutrient	Patterson & Flint (1982)
	350, 675	Phy	—	—	—	—	Root RWR —↑	Competition	Patterson <i>et al.</i> (1984)
	330, 450, 600, 800	SPAR	↑	—	—	—	—	—	Reddy <i>et al.</i> (1989a)
	340, 520, 720, 910	OTC	↑	—	—	—	—	—	Rogers <i>et al.</i> (1983a)
	350, 700	Phy	↑	↑	—	—	Root diameter and volume —↑ Stele diameter and cortex width —↑ Root RWR and penetration —↑ Total N —↑	—	Rogers <i>et al.</i> (1992b)
	400, 1000	Phy	—	—	—	—	N uptake efficiency —NE N uptake efficiency —↑	Temperature*	Rufy <i>et al.</i> (1981)
	Amb, 1000	OTC	—	—	—	—	Nodule fresh weight —↑ Specific nodule activity —↑ Acetylene reductase activity —↑ Nodule DW and volume —↑ Total nodule activity —↑	Straw*	Shivashankar & Viassak (1978)
<i>Glycine soja</i>	Amb, 1000	OTC	—	—	—	—	—	—	Shivashankar <i>et al.</i> (1976)
	350, 675	Phy	↑	—	—	—	—	Nutrient	Sionit (1983)
	350, 675	Phy	—	NE	—	—	—	Light	Sionit <i>et al.</i> (1982)
	350, 675, 1000	Phy	↑	NE	—	—	Total N —↑; root [N] —↑	Temperature*	Sionit <i>et al.</i> (1987)
	400, 650, 900	Phy	NE	↓	—	—	Nodule DW —↑	N	Vessey <i>et al.</i> (1990)
<i>Gossypium hirsutum</i>	320, 1000	GC	↑	—	—	—	Total N —↑ Nodule DW —↑; total N —↑ Total nodule activity —↑ Leaf and stem [N] —↓ Root and nodule [N] —↑	N*	Williams <i>et al.</i> (1981)
	350, 1000	GC	↑	—	—	—	—	N*	Masuda <i>et al.</i> (1989)
	340, 640	OTC	—	NE	—	—	—	—	Idso <i>et al.</i> (1988)
	Amb, 550	FACE	—	—	—	—	δ ¹³ C Composition —↑	—	Leavitt <i>et al.</i> (1993)
	340, 680	Phy	—	↑	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)
	350, 700	Phy	NE	—	—	—	Root RWR —↓	Temperature*	Patterson <i>et al.</i> (1988)

<i>Helianthus annuus</i>	Amb, 550	FACE	↑	—	↑	—	Root volume —↑	H ₂ O*	Prior <i>et al.</i> (1993)	
	Amb, 550	FACE	↑	↑	↑	↑	Root density in soil —↑	—	Rogers <i>et al.</i> (1993)	
	270, 350, 650	Phy	↑	↑	—	—	Root diameter and volume —↑	Pot size*	Thomas & Strain (1991)	
	330, 640	GH	—	—	—	—	Tissue [N] —↓	—	Wong (1979)	
	320, 640	GH	—	—	—	—	Root [NSC] —↑	N*	Wong (1990)	
	300, 600, 1200	GC in GH	↑	—	—	—	—	—	Carlson & Bazzaz (1980)	
	340, 680	Phy	—	NE	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)	
	300, 1000, 3300	GC	—	NE	—	—	—	Ford & Thorne (1967)	Morison & Gifford (1984b)	
	340, 680	Phy	—	NE	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Bhattacharya <i>et al.</i> (1985a)	
	350, 675, 1000	Phy	↑	↑	—	—	Tubers/plant —↑; tuber DW —↑	—	Bhattacharya <i>et al.</i> (1989b)	
<i>Ipomoea batatas</i>	350, 675, 1000	Phy	—	—	—	—	Tuber RGR —↑; tuber diameter —↑	—	—	
	364, 438, 666	OTC	↑	↑	—	—	Root [sucrose] —↑	H ₂ O*	Bhattacharya <i>et al.</i> (1990)	
	350, 675, 1000	Phy	—	—	—	—	Root [starch and glucose] —NE	—	—	
	380, 1200	GH	—	↓	↑	—	Root [protein] —NE	IAA*	Bhattacharya <i>et al.</i> (1985a)	
	350, 700	GH	↑	—	—	—	Tuber [sucrose] —↓	NO ₃ *	Caporn (1989)	
	340, 680	Phy	—	NE	—	—	Tuber [starch and glucose] —↑	N* P	Goudriaan & de Ruiter (1983)	
	350, 1000	GC	↑	—	—	—	Tuber [protein] —NE	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)	
	60–3000	GC	↑	—	—	—	Root fresh weight —↑	Light*	Hurd (1968)	
	Amb, 1300	GC	↑	—	—	—	Tuber [starch] —↑	Light*	Ito (1970)	
	350, 675	Phy	↑	—	—	—	Leaf H ₂ O potential —↑	—	Ito (1972)	
<i>Lactuca sativa</i>	350, 1000	GH	↑	NE	—	—	—	H ₂ O*	Paez <i>et al.</i> (1984)	
	300, 1000	GH	↑	↑	—	—	—	Root hormone*	Tognoni <i>et al.</i> (1967)	
	300, 1000	GH	↑	↑	—	—	—	—	Wittwer (1966)	
	300, 1000	GH	↑	↑	—	—	—	—	Wittwer (1970)	
	330, 800	GH	↑	—	—	—	Total N, P, K uptake —↑	—	Yelle <i>et al.</i> (1987)	
	<i>Macropitilium atropurpureum</i>	340, 680	Phy	—	↑	—	—	Root [N] —↑; leaf [N] —↓	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)
		350, 700	GH	↓	—	—	—	N, P, K uptake efficiency —NE	N*, P	Goudriaan & de Ruiter (1983)
		350–2400	GC	↑	NE	—	—	Root N reductase activity —↑	Light*	MacDowall (1982)
		340, 680	Phy	—	↑	—	—	Nodulation —↑	NO ₃ *	—
		Amb, Elev	GH	—	↑	—	—	Nitrogenase activity —↑	Nodulation	—
160–900		SPAR	↑	↑	—	—	% Cuttings rooted —↑	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)	
160–3500		GC	—	↑	—	—	Penetration —↑	—	Rallo & del Rio (1990)	
350, 700		GH	↑	—	—	—	% Dry matter in roots —↑	—	Baker <i>et al.</i> (1990a)	
340, 680		Phy	—	↑	—	—	—	—	Imai & Murata (1976)	
340, 680		Phy	—	NE	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Imai <i>et al.</i> (1985)	
<i>Phalaris aquatica</i>	340–3000	GC	NE	—	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)	
	320, 2500	GC	↑	—	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)	
	300, 1000	GH	↑	↑	—	—	—	—	Morison & Gifford (1984b)	
	300, 1000	GH	↑	↑	—	—	—	Salinity*	Jolliffe & Ehret (1985)	
	300, 1000	GH	—	↑	—	—	—	Root hormone*	Schwarz & Gale (1984)	
	300, 1000	GH	—	↑	—	—	—	—	Tognoni <i>et al.</i> (1967)	
	300, 1000	GH	—	↑	—	—	—	—	Wittwer (1966)	
	300, 1000	GH	—	↑	—	—	—	—	Wittwer (1970)	
	<i>Olea europaea</i>	340, 680	Phy	—	↑	—	—	Nodulation —↑	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)
		350, 700	GH	—	—	—	—	Nodule DW —↑	N*, P	Goudriaan & de Ruiter (1983)
350–2400		GC	↑	NE	—	—	Nodule number —↑	Light*	MacDowall (1982)	
340, 680		Phy	—	↑	—	—	Nitrogenase activity —↑	NO ₃ *	—	
Amb, Elev		GH	—	↑	—	—	% Cuttings rooted —↑	Nodulation	—	
160–900		SPAR	↑	↑	—	—	Penetration —↑	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)	
160–3500		GC	—	↑	—	—	% Dry matter in roots —↑	—	Rallo & del Rio (1990)	
350, 700		GH	↑	—	—	—	—	—	Baker <i>et al.</i> (1990a)	
340, 680		Phy	—	↑	—	—	—	—	Imai & Murata (1976)	
340, 680		Phy	—	NE	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Imai <i>et al.</i> (1985)	
<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i>	340–3000	GC	NE	—	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)	
	320, 2500	GC	↑	—	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)	
	300, 1000	GH	↑	↑	—	—	—	—	Morison & Gifford (1984b)	
	300, 1000	GH	—	↑	—	—	—	Salinity*	Jolliffe & Ehret (1985)	
	300, 1000	GH	—	↑	—	—	—	Root hormone*	Schwarz & Gale (1984)	
	300, 1000	GH	—	↑	—	—	—	—	Tognoni <i>et al.</i> (1967)	
	300, 1000	GH	—	↑	—	—	—	—	Wittwer (1966)	
	300, 1000	GH	—	↑	—	—	—	—	Wittwer (1970)	
	<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i>	340, 680	Phy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
		350, 700	GH	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
340, 680		Phy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
340, 680		Phy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
340, 680		Phy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
340, 680		Phy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
340, 680		Phy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
340, 680		Phy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
340, 680		Phy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
340, 680		Phy	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	

(continued)

Table 4—contd.

Species	[CO ₂] ppm	Location	Response				Other	Interaction	Reference
			RDW	R	TS	RL	RN		
<i>Pisum sativum</i>	320, 1800	GC	↑	—	—	↑	NE	Leaf H ₂ O potential — ↑ Leaf turgor pressure — ↑	IAA Davis & Potter (1982)
	Amb, Elev	?	—	—	—	—	—	Nodule DW — ↑ Specific N ₂ fixing activity — ↑	— Hardy & Havelka (1977)
	Amb, 1200	GC	—	—	—	—	—	Nodules per plant — ↑ Nodule density — ↑ Total N — ↑ Specific nodule activity — ↓	N Masterson & Sherwood (1978)
	340, 680	Phy	—	NE	—	—	—	—	H ₂ O Morison & Gifford (1984b)
	350, 1000	Phy	↑	—	—	—	—	—	— Paez <i>et al.</i> (1980)
<i>Raphanus sativus</i>	350, 675	Phy	↑	—	—	—	—	Leaf H ₂ O potential — ↑ Nodule DW — ↑; total N — ↑	H ₂ O* Paez <i>et al.</i> (1983)
	320, 120	GC	—	—	—	—	—	Specific nodule activity — NE	— Phillips <i>et al.</i> (1976)
	Amb, Elev	GC	—	—	—	—	—	Root fresh weight — ↑ Time to harvest — ↓	— Cummings & Jones (1918)
	340, 640	OTC	—	↑	—	—	—	—	— Idso <i>et al.</i> (1988)
	Doubling	N/A	—	—	—	—	—	Root yield — ↑	— Kimball (1983a)
<i>Rubus idaeus</i>	Doubling	N/A	—	—	—	—	—	Root yield — ↑	— Kimball (1983b)
	400, 1200	GC (Field)	—	↑	—	—	—	Root fresh weight — ↑	— Knecht (1975)
	340, 680	Phy	—	↑	—	—	—	—	H ₂ O Morison & Gifford (1984b)
	270, 350, 650	Phy	↑	—	—	—	—	Tuber DW — ↑ Tissue [N] — ↓	— Overdieck <i>et al.</i> (1988)
	350, 675	Phy	—	↑	—	—	—	—	Light* Sionit <i>et al.</i> (1982)
<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>	330, 1650, 3000	GC	↑	↑	—	—	↑	—	Light Laforge <i>et al.</i> (1991)
	Amb, Elev	GC	—	—	—	—	—	Tuber number — ↑ Tuber weight — ↑ Time to harvest — ↓	— Cummings & Jones (1918)
	350, 700	GH	↓	—	—	—	—	Tuber DW — ↓	—
	350, 700	GC	↑	↑	—	—	—	—	Solar rad.* Goudriaan & de Ruiter (1983)
	Doubling	N/A	—	—	—	—	—	Tuber yield — ↑	— Hayashi <i>et al.</i> (1990)
<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>	Doubling	N/A	—	—	—	—	—	Tuber yield — ↑	— Kimball (1983a)
	365, 1000	GC	↑	—	—	—	—	Tuber DW — ↑	— Kimball (1983b)
	350, 1000	GC	↑	—	—	—	—	Tuber DW — ↑	— Wheeler & Tibbitts (1989)
	330, 485, 660, 795	GC	—	NE	—	—	—	—	— Wheeler <i>et al.</i> (1991)
	340, 680	Phy	—	↓	—	—	—	—	Light Chaudhuri <i>et al.</i> (1986)
<i>Trifolium pratense</i>	300–8000	GH	—	—	—	—	—	Nodule number — ↑ Total N — ↑; tissue [N] — ↓	H ₂ O Morison & Gifford (1984b)
	Amb, 1200	GC	—	—	—	—	—	Nodule density — NE	— Wilson <i>et al.</i> (1933)
	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	Specific nodule activity — ↑ Root [NO ₃ -reductase] — NE	— Masterson & Sherwood (1978)
	340, 680	Phy	—	↑	—	—	—	—	H ₂ O Morison & Gifford (1984b)
	200, 350, 1000	GC	↑	↑	—	—	—	Root [NSC] — ↑	— Scheidegger & Nösberger (1984)
<i>Triticum aestivum</i>	340, 485, 660, 825	GC (Field)	↑	NE	—	—	—	Penetration speed — ↑	— Chaudhuri <i>et al.</i> (1990)
	330, 660	GC	↑	—	—	—	—	Dry matter partitioning — NE	Density* Du Cloux <i>et al.</i> (1987)
	—150, Amb, +200	Phy	—	—	—	—	—	% Dry weight in roots — NE	Light Gifford (1977)

Amb, +250	Phy	↑	↓	—	—	—	H ₂ O*	Gifford (1979)
350, 700	GH	↑	—	—	—	—	N*, P	Goudriaan & de Ruiter (1983)
Amb, 1500	GH	↑	↑	—	—	—	N*	Hocking & Meyer (1991)
350, 700	GC	↑	↓	—	—	—	—	Lekkerkerk <i>et al.</i> (1990)
350, 1300, 2200	GH	↑	↑	—	—	—	Light*	MacDowall (1972)
120, 220, 320, 500	GC	↑	↓	—	—	—	Compaction*	Masle <i>et al.</i> (1990)
340, 680	Phy	—	NE	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)
350, 1000	Phy	↑	NE	—	—	—	H ₂ O*	Sionit <i>et al.</i> (1980)
350, 675	Phy	↑	↑	—	—	—	Nutrient*	Sionit <i>et al.</i> (1981a)
350, 675, 1000	Phy	—	↑	—	—	—	—	Sionit <i>et al.</i> (1981c)
350, 1000	Phy	↑	NE	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Sionit <i>et al.</i> (1981d)
320, 640	GH	↑	↑↓	—	—	—	Light*, N*	Wong & Osmond (1991)
330, 350, 700	GH	↑	—	—	—	—	Competition*	Goudriaan & de Ruiter (1983)
340, 680	Phy	—	NE	—	—	—	N*, P	Morison & Gifford (1984b)
350, 675, 1000	Phy	↑	—	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Bhattacharya <i>et al.</i> (1985b)
340, 680	Phy	↑	NE	—	—	—	—	Morison & Gifford (1984b)
270, 350, 650	Phy	↑	—	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Overdieck <i>et al.</i> (1988)
Amb, 1200	GC	↑	↑	—	—	—	—	Kriedemann <i>et al.</i> (1976)
300, 600, 1200	GC in GH	NE	—	—	—	—	—	Carlson & Bazzaz (1980)
350, 700	GH	↑	—	—	—	—	N*, P	Goudriaan & de Ruiter (1983)
Amb, 1500	GH	NE	—	—	—	—	N	Hocking & Meyer (1991)
160–3500	GC	—	—	—	—	—	—	Imai & Murata (1976)
350, 600, 800	GC	NE	—	—	—	—	H ₂ O	King & Greer (1986)
340, 680	Phy	—	NE	—	—	—	H ₂ O	Morison & Gifford (1984b)
350, 600, 1000	GC	—	NE	—	—	—	—	Patterson & Flint (1980)
340, 520, 720, 910	OTC	↑	—	—	—	—	—	Rogers <i>et al.</i> (1983a)
320, 2500	GC	NE	—	—	—	—	Salinity	Schwarz & Gale (1984)
350, 675	Phy	—	NE	—	—	—	Light	Sionit <i>et al.</i> (1982)
400, 550, 800	GC	↑	↑	—	—	—	—	Whipps (1985)
330, 640	GH	—	—	—	—	—	—	Wong (1979)
350, 1200	GC	↑	↑	NE	—	—	—	Davis & Potter (1983)
325, 600, 900	GC	↑	—	—	—	—	—	Hughes & Cockshull (1969)
Amb, 1100 (Mist)	GH	—	—	—	—	—	Season*	French & Alsbury (1989)
300, 900, 1800	GC	—	—	—	—	—	Light*	Moe (1977)
300, 1050 (Mist)	GH	—	—	—	—	—	Temperature	Lin & Molnar (1980)
Amb, 1900	GC	↑	—	—	—	—	—	Molnar & Cummings (1968)
300, 1650 (Mist)	GH	—	—	—	—	—	—	Molnar & Cummings (1968)
340, 940	GC	↑	↓	—	—	—	RH*	Gislerød & Nelson (1989)
350, 1200	GC	—	NE	NE	NE	—	—	Davis & Potter (1983)
350, 1200	GC	↑	—	NE	NE	—	—	Davis & Potter (1983)
350, 1200	GC	—	—	↑	NE	—	—	Davis & Potter (1983)

Agro-Ecosystem Components: Horticulture

Begonia argenteo-guttata

Callistephus chinensis

Camellia japonica

Campanula isophylla

Chamaecyparis sp.

Chrysanthemum sp.

Chrysanthemum morifolium

Ficus pumila

Fuchsia magellanica

Hemigraphis alternata

(continued)

Table 4—contd.

Species	[CO ₂] ppm	Location	RDW	Response R : TS RL	RN	Other	Interaction	Reference
<i>Ilex aquifolium</i>	300, 1050 (Mist)	GH	—	—	—	% Cuttings rooted — ↑ Rootball diameter — ↑ % Cuttings rooted — NE	Light	Lin & Molnar (1981)
<i>Ilex crenata</i>	300, 1050 (Mist)	GH	—	—	—	—	Light	Lin & Molnar (1980)
<i>Impatiens balsamina</i>	350, 675, 1000	Phy	—	—	—	—	IAA*	Bhattacharya <i>et al.</i> (1989 <i>a</i>)
<i>Juniperus horizontalis</i>	300, 1650 (Mist)	GH	—	—	—	% Cuttings rooted — ↑	—	Molnar & Cummings (1968)
<i>Juniperus sabina</i>	300, 1050 (Mist)	GH	—	—	—	% Cuttings rooted — NE	Light	Lin & Molnar (1981)
<i>Juniperus squamata</i>	300, 1050 (Mist)	GH	—	—	NE	% Cuttings rooted — NE	Light	Lin & Molnar (1981)
<i>Magnolia sieboldii</i>	300, 1050 (Mist)	GH	—	—	↑	% Cuttings rooted — NE	Light	Lin & Molnar (1981)
<i>Magnolia soulangiana</i>	300, 1050 (Mist)	GH	—	—	↑	% Cuttings rooted — ↑	Light*	Lin & Molnar (1981)
<i>Osmanthus heterophyllus</i>	350, 1200	GC	NE	—	NE	—	—	Davis & Potter (1983)
<i>Pelargonium × hortorum</i>	350, 1200	GC	—	—	NE	—	—	Davis & Potter (1983)
<i>Peperomia glabella</i>	350, 1200	GC	↑	—	↑	—	—	Davis & Potter (1983)
<i>Peperomia nivalis</i>	350, 1200	GC	↑	—	↑	—	—	Davis & Potter (1983)
<i>Potentilla fruticosa</i>	Amb, 1900	GC	—	—	NE	—	—	Molnar & Cummings (1968)
	300, 1650	GC	—	—	↑	% Cuttings rooted — ↑	—	Molnar & Cummings (1968)
	Amb, 1100 (Mist)	GH	—	—	—	% Cuttings rooted — ↑	Season*	French (1989)
<i>Rhododendron</i> sp.	300, 1050 (Mist)	GH	—	—	—	% Cuttings rooted — ↑	Light*	Lin & Molnar (1981)
			—	—	—	Rootball diameter — ↑	—	
<i>Rosa hybrida</i>	300, 1000, 2000	GH	—	—	—	Root systems smaller at 2000	—	Mattson & Widmer (1971)
<i>Taxus × media</i>	300, 1050 (Mist)	GH	—	—	↑	Root fresh weight — ↑	—	Lin & Molnar (1980)
<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>	300, 1650 (Mist)	GH	—	—	↑	% Cuttings rooted — ↑	—	Molnar & Cummings (1968)
<i>Weigela</i> sp.	Amb, 1900	GC	—	—	↑	% Cuttings rooted — ↑	—	Molnar & Cummings (1968)
Forest Ecosystem Components								
<i>Acer rubrum</i>	400, 700	GC	—	NE	—	—	—	Bazzaz <i>et al.</i> (1990)
<i>Acer saccharinum</i>	300, 600, 1200	GC in GH	↑	—	—	—	—	Carlson & Bazzaz (1980)
<i>Acer saccharum</i>	400, 700	GC	—	NE	—	—	—	Bazzaz <i>et al.</i> (1990)
<i>Alnus glutinosa</i>	350, 700	GC	—	—	—	RWR — NE; nodule DW — ↑ Nodule weight ratio — ↑ Specific nodule activity — NE Total N, P, K, Ca — NE; total Mg — ↑	—	Norby (1987)
			—	—	—	[N], [P], [K], [Ca] — ↓; [Mg] — NE	—	
			—	—	—	Nodes/plant — NE	—	
			—	—	—	Nodule DW — NE	—	
			—	—	—	Tissue [N] — ↑	—	
			—	—	—	Specific nitrogenase activity — ↑	—	
			—	—	—	Total nitrogenase activity — ↑	—	
<i>Alnus rubra</i>	350, 650	GC	↑	—	—	—	N*	Arnone & Gordon (1990)
			—	—	—	—	Nodulation*	
			—	—	—	—	—	
<i>Betula</i> sp.	300, 1000, 2000	GH	—	—	—	—	—	Hårdh (1966)
<i>Betula papyrifera</i>	400, 700	GC	—	NE	—	—	—	Bazzaz <i>et al.</i> (1990)
<i>Castanea sativa</i>	350, 700	GC	↑	↑	—	—	—	Mousseau & Enoch (1989)
<i>Cedrus atlanticus</i>	350, 800	GH	↑	NE	↑	Root [starch] — NE RWR — ↓; nodule DW — NE	—	Kauschal <i>et al.</i> (1989)
<i>Elaeagnus angustifolia</i>	350, 700	GC	—	—	—	Nodule weight ratio — NE Total nodule activity — NE Specific nodule activity — NE	—	Norby (1987)

Table 4—contd.

Species	[CO ₂] ppm	Location	RDW	Response R : TS RL	RN	Other	Interaction	Reference
<i>Robinia pseudacacia</i>	350, 700	GC	—	—	—	RWR — NE; nodule DW — ↑ Nodule weight ratio — NE Total nodule activity — ↑ Specific nodule activity — NE Total N, P, K, Ca, Mg — NE [N] — ↓; [P], [K], [Ca], [Mg] — NE	—	Norby (1987)
<i>Tsuga canadensis</i>	400, 700	GC	—	NE	—	—	—	Bazzaz <i>et al.</i> (1990)
Natural Community Components								
<i>Abutilon theophrasti</i>	300, 600, 1200 350, 700	GC in GH GC in GH	↑ —	— —	— —	— Leaf H ₂ O potential — ↑ Leaf [N] — ↓	— —	Carlson & Bazzaz (1980) Garbutt <i>et al.</i> (1990)
<i>Agropyron smithii</i>	350, 600, 1000	GC	—	↑	—	RWR — NE	Temperature*	Patterson & Flint (1980)
<i>Amaranthus edulis</i>	350, 700	Phy	↑	—	—	—	—	Patterson <i>et al.</i> (1988)
<i>Amaranthus retroflexus</i>	340, 680 340, 680 300, 600, 1200 300, 600, 1200 350, 700	GH Phy GC in GH GC in GH GC in GH	— ↑ — — —	NE ↓ ↑ — —	— — — — —	— — — Leaf H ₂ O potential — ↑ Leaf [N] — ↓	— H ₂ O SO ₂ * —	Smith <i>et al.</i> (1987) Morison & Gifford (1984b) Carlson & Bazzaz (1980) Carlson & Bazzaz (1982) Garbutt <i>et al.</i> (1990)
<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i>	300, 600, 1200 350, 700	GC in GH GC in GH	↑ —	— —	— —	— Leaf H ₂ O potential — ↑ Leaf [N] — ↓	— —	Carlson & Bazzaz (1980) Garbutt <i>et al.</i> (1990)
<i>Andropogon gerardii</i>	350, 700	OTC	—	—	—	Total N and P — ↑ Root N and P — ↑ Aboveground [N] — ↓; [P] — NE Root [N] — NE; [P] — ↓	—	Owensby <i>et al.</i> (1993a)
<i>Andropogon glomeratus</i>	350, 700	OTC	↑	—	—	—	—	Owensby <i>et al.</i> (1993b)
<i>Anoda cristata</i>	350, 500, 650	Phy	↓	NE	—	—	Salinity*	Bowman & Strain (1987)
<i>Artemisia tridentata</i>	350, 700	Phy	NE	—	—	RWR — NE	Temperature	Patterson <i>et al.</i> (1988)
<i>Atriplex halimus</i>	350, 650	Phy	NE	↑	—	Leaf [NE] — ↓	Nutrient*	Johnson & Lincoln (1991)
<i>Betula nana</i>	320, 2500 350, 675	GC Phy	↑ NE	— NE	— —	— Leaf [N], [P], [K], [Ca], [Mg] — ↓ Other leaf [nutrients] — NE	Salinity* Nutrient	Schwartz & Gale (1984) Oberbauer <i>et al.</i> (1986)
<i>Bouteloua gracilis</i>	350, 675, 1000	Phy	NE	—	—	—	—	Riechers & Strain (1988)
<i>Bromus mollis</i>	350, 650	Phy	↑	↑	—	Leaf [N] — ↓	N*	Larigauderie <i>et al.</i> (1988)
<i>Bromus tectorum</i>	340, 680	GH	—	NE	—	—	—	Smith <i>et al.</i> (1987)
<i>Carex bigelowii</i>	350, 675	Phy	NE	↑	—	Leaf [N], [P], [K], [others] — ↑	Nutrient*	Oberbauer <i>et al.</i> (1986)
<i>Cassia obtusifolia</i>	350, 675	Phy	—	—	—	RWR — NE	Nutrient	Patterson & Flint (1982)
<i>Chenopodium album</i>	300, 600, 1200 350, 700	GC in GH GC in GH	— —	NE —	— —	— Leaf H ₂ O potential ↑ Leaf [N] — ↓ RWR — ↓	SO ₂ * —	Carlson & Bazzaz (1982) Garbutt <i>et al.</i> (1990)
<i>Crotalaria spectabilis</i>	350, 675	Phy	—	—	—	—	Nutrient*	Patterson & Flint (1982)
<i>Datura stramonium</i>	300, 600, 1200	GC in GH	↑	—	—	—	—	Carlson & Bazzaz (1980)
<i>Desmodium paniculatum</i>	300, 600, 1200	GC in GH	—	NE	—	—	SO ₂ *	Carlson & Bazzaz (1982)
<i>Digitaria ciliaris</i>	350, 1000 350, 675	Phy Phy	— —	NE —	— —	— RWR — ↑	— H ₂ O*	Wulff & Strain (1982) Patterson (1986)

<i>Echinochloa crus-galli</i>	350, 675	Phy	—	—	—	RWR — NE	H ₂ O*	Patterson (1986)
<i>Eleusine indica</i>	350, 675	Phy	↑	—	—	—	Temperature*	Potvin & Strain (1985)
	350, 675	Phy	—	—	—	RWR — ↓	H ₂ O*	Patterson (1986)
	350, 675	Phy	↑	—	—	—	Temperature*	Potvin & Strain (1985)
<i>Eragrostis orcuttiana</i>	340, 680	GH	—	NE	—	—	—	Smith <i>et al.</i> (1987)
<i>Festuca arundinacea</i>	330, 660	GC	—	—	—	N uptake — NE	—	Gastal & Saugier (1989)
<i>Festuca elatior</i>	350, 600	GC in GH	↑	↑	—	RWR — ↑	Competition*	Carter & Peterson (1983)
<i>Layia platyglossa</i>	300–2100	GC	—	—	—	—	—	St. Omer & Horvath (1984)
<i>Ledum palustre</i>	350, 675	Phy	NE	↑	—	—	—	Oberbauer <i>et al.</i> (1986)
<i>Lonicera japonica</i>	350, 675, 1000	Phy	↑	—	—	—	—	Sasek & Strain (1990)
<i>Nymphaea</i> sp.	350, 650	OTC	↑	—	↑	[N], [P], [K], [Ca], [Mg] — NE	—	Idso <i>et al.</i> (1990)
<i>Oryzopsis hymenoides</i>	340, 680	GH	↑	—	—	Number of new rhizomes — ↑	—	Smith <i>et al.</i> (1987)
<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>	380, 700	GC	↑	↑	—	—	Herbivory	Fajer <i>et al.</i> (1991)
<i>Plantago major</i>	350, 700	GC	—	↓	—	—	—	Poorter <i>et al.</i> (1988)
<i>Poa pratensis</i>	350, 700	OTC	—	—	—	Root [starch] — NE	—	Owensby <i>et al.</i> (1993a)
						Root respiration — ↑	—	
						Aboveground N — ↓; [N] — ↓	—	
						Root N — ↑; Root [N] — NE	—	
						Aboveground [P] — NE; [P] — ↓	—	
						Root P — ↑; root [P] — ↓	—	
<i>Polygonum pensylvanicum</i>	350, 700	OTC	↑	—	—	—	—	Owensby <i>et al.</i> (1993b)
<i>Pueraria lobata</i>	300, 600, 1200	GC in GH	—	NE	—	—	SO ₂ *	Carlson & Bazzaz (1982)
	350, 675, 1000	Phy	↑	↓	↑	RWR — ↓	—	Sasek & Strain (1988)
	350, 675, 1000	Phy	↑	—	—	—	—	Sasek & Strain (1990)
<i>Rotiboealia exaltata</i>	350, 600, 1000	GC	—	NE	—	—	—	Patterson & Flint (1980)
<i>Scirpus olneyi</i>	Amb, +338	OTC	↑	—	—	—	Competition*	Curtis <i>et al.</i> (1990)
						Root [N] — ↓	—	
						Rhizome DW — ↑	—	
<i>Setaria faberii</i>	300, 600, 1200	GC in GH	—	↓	—	—	SO ₂ *	Carlson & Bazzaz (1982)
	350, 700	GC in GH	—	—	—	Leaf H ₂ O potential — ↑	—	Garbutt <i>et al.</i> (1990)
						Leaf [N] — ↓	—	
<i>Setaria latescens</i>	300, 600, 1200	GC in GH	—	↓	—	—	SO ₂ *	Carlson & Bazzaz (1982)
<i>Sorghum halepense</i>	350, 600	GC in GH	↑	↑	—	RWR — ↑	Competition*	Carter & Peterson (1983)
	350, 675	Phy	—	—	—	RWR — ↑	Competition*	Patterson <i>et al.</i> (1984)
<i>Spartina alterniflora</i>	100, 900	GC (field)	—	—	—	Total and root acetylene	—	Whiting <i>et al.</i> (1986)
						Reductase activity — ↑	—	
<i>Spartina patens</i>	Amb, +338	OTC	NE	—	—	—	Competition	Curtis <i>et al.</i> (1990)
						Root [N] — NE	—	
<i>Xanthium occidentale</i>	Amb, 1500	GH	↑	NE	—	Rhizome DW — NE	N*	Hocking & Meyer (1985)
<i>Xanthium strumarium</i>	320, 2500	GC	↑	—	—	Root [N] — ↑	Salinity*	Schwarz & Gale (1984)

Concentrations are in ppm CO₂. Amb = ambient (+ or – refers to ppm CO₂ above or below ambient). Elev = elevated.

Locations: GC = growth chamber; GH = glasshouse (including plastic houses); N/A = not applicable (for reviews; Kimball, 1983a,b); OTC = open top chamber; SPAR = sunlit plant-atmosphere research chamber; Phy = phytotron; FACE = free-air CO₂ enrichment system.

Responses: RDW = root dry weight; R : TS = total root to total shoot ratio (usually on dry weight basis); RL = root length; RN = root number; ↑ = increase; ↓ = decrease; NE = no effect.

Definitions of terms used: total = per plant; specific = per unit weight of tissue; uptake efficiency = unit of nutrient per unit weight of root; utilization efficiency = unit of biomass produced per unit of nutrient; DW = dry weight; NSC = nonstructural carbohydrates; [] = amount per unit weight of tissue; RGR = relative growth rate (growth per unit time); RWR = root weight ratio (ratio weight/whole plant weight).

Interactions indicates variables which were examined. An asterisk (*) indicates the interaction of the variable with CO₂ concentration was significant.




Fig. 10. Photographs of 35 day old soybean plants and their root systems grown at 350 ppm (left) and 700 ppm CO₂ (right) in growth rooms of the Duke University Phytotron.

example of this research can be seen in Fig. 10, where the soybean plant grown with air containing a twice ambient concentration of CO₂ has a visually larger root system than the one grown in ambient air. Rogers *et al.* (1992b) demonstrated significant increases in root dry weight, volume, diameter, R:TS weight ratio, as well as root length at most soil depths to 50 cm, for high CO₂-grown soybean plants. However, the total number of soybean roots (and numbers of roots) at most depths exhibited no response to CO₂ enrichment.

Laboratory work has also been conducted on cotton plants in connection with the FACE project (Prior, 1992; Prior *et al.*, 1993; Rogers *et al.*, 1993). Dry weights, lengths and volumes of taproots, lateral roots and fine roots tended to be higher for CO₂ enriched cotton plants, even when CO₂ exposures occurred for only six weeks. Although the numbers of lateral roots per unit length of taproot tended not to be significantly increased by elevated CO₂, the overall greater taproot lengths under CO₂ enrichment tended to provide increased total numbers of laterals. A unique feature of this FACE-cotton root research was the investigation of root architecture, i.e. the distribution of fine root density per unit volume of soil (expressed as length or dry weight per m³) both vertically and horizontally (Figs 11a and b). The density of fine roots was seen to increase under CO₂ enrichment at most depths to 90 cm, but was increased more significantly in the upper 45 cm of the soil profile. The root length and dry weight densities also tended to exhibit greater differences between ambient and elevated CO₂ treatments as horizontal distance from row center increased, indicating faster and/or more prolific spread of cotton roots under elevated CO₂. Research efforts concerning the effects of CO₂ on belowground processes are continuing in our laboratory, where we are currently investigating effects of elevated CO₂ on interacting aspects of root growth, root exudation, carbon cycling in soil, mineral weathering, and soil microbiology in a C₃ (soybean) and a C₄ (sorghum) crop.

Detailed work with roots and belowground responses of crops plants to atmospheric CO₂ enrichment have added substantial support to the findings of the more numerous cursory reports in that increasing concentrations of CO₂ result in, often dramatic, increased root growth parameters. Detailed research is also being conducted with non-agronomic crop plants. Davis and Potter (1983) reported significant increases in root length and dry weight for several ornamental species, but found increases in root number only for *Peperomia*.

Substantial CO₂ research has been conducted at Oak Ridge National Laboratory with several forest tree species, including shortleaf pine (Norby *et al.*, 1987; O'Neill *et al.*, 1987b), Virginia pine (Luxmoore *et al.*, 1986), white oak (Norby *et al.*, 1986a,b; O'Neill *et al.*, 1987b; Norby & O'Neill, 1989), yellow poplar (O'Neill *et al.*, 1987a; Norby *et al.*, 1992), and nitrogen-fixing woody plants (Norby, 1987). Generally, these tree species have demonstrated increases in root dry weight, R:TS, nutrient uptake, carbon allocation to roots, root




Fig. 11. (a) Root length density and (b) root dry weight density of cotton eight weeks after planting during vegetative growth under ambient level CO₂ (360 ppm) and free-air CO₂ enrichment (550 ppm) in Maricopa, Arizona (Prior, 1992).

exudation, and mycorrhizal colonization under elevated CO₂. Other detailed work conducted with two species of ornamental trees, Atlas cedar and Austrian pine (Kaushal *et al.*, 1989), demonstrated positive but varying root responses to CO₂ enrichment which the authors related to differences in phenological root growth patterns between the two species.

Research with natural community plant species has demonstrated increased root dry mass for *Scirpus*, but not for *Spartina*, at depths up to 15 cm, while roots of mixed communities of the two species were significantly different only at the 10–15 cm depth (Curtis *et al.*, 1990). *Scirpus*, whether alone or in mixed communities,

also demonstrated lower percent nitrogen and, thus, higher C:N ratios when grown under elevated CO₂. Recent detailed studies in a tallgrass prairie ecosystem (Owensby *et al.*, 1993b) have demonstrated increased root biomass production for some species which may have led, at least in part, to alterations in species composition. Other work in this ecosystem (Owensby *et al.*, 1993a) with nutrient dynamics demonstrated that total and/or root nitrogen and phosphorus contents tended to increase, while concentrations on a per unit weight of tissue basis tended to be lower under CO₂ enrichment.

Even though more and detailed studies are being conducted on the effects of elevated atmospheric CO₂ on belowground plant structure and function, this area of research remains largely neglected. Progress toward understanding subterranean processes has often been hampered by a lack of effective methodology with which to study plant roots and soil dwelling organisms. New and better approaches to the study of roots and the rhizosphere are indeed needed and are beginning to be developed, including new extraction techniques (Prior & Rogers, 1992), minirhizotrons (Kaushal *et al.*, 1989), NMR imaging (Bottomley *et al.*, 1993), and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ determinations of belowground carbon allocation (Wong & Osmond, 1991; Leavitt *et al.*, 1993).

RHIZOSPHERE

Increasing levels of atmospheric CO₂ will influence not only plant roots but also the environment of those roots. The rhizosphere, defined by Curl and Truelove (1986) as 'that narrow zone of soil subject to the influence of living roots', is not likely to be directly influenced by increasing atmospheric CO₂ since its concentration in the soil is already ten to fifty times that existing in the atmosphere (Lamborg *et al.*, 1983). However, plant mediated responses to elevated CO₂ in the atmosphere have the potential to alter the deposition of materials by plant roots into the rhizosphere and, thus, rhizosphere microbial composition and activity. These impacts on the rhizosphere will greatly affect the health and productivity of plants growing in future, higher CO₂ environments.

An important connection between the rhizosphere and root systems of some crop plants, the legumes, is nitrogen fixation (the incorporation of atmospheric nitrogen into nitrogenous compounds which can be utilized by living organisms). Legume/bacterial symbiosis is significantly increased by elevated CO₂ levels (Reddy *et al.*, 1989a; Reardon *et al.*, 1990). Phillips *et al.* (1976) obtained results indicating that short-term high CO₂ exposures increased fixation by affecting nodule function in peas while long-term enrichment promoted fixation by enhancing nodule development. In their work with white clover, Masterson and Sherwood (1978) found that the normally expected reduction in nitrogen fixation at high levels of nitrogen did not occur at elevated CO₂ concentrations. Acock (1990) concluded that, in general, the increase appears

to be mainly due to larger biomass, i.e. bigger plants, more carbon allocation for nitrogen fixation.

Mycorrhizae, the symbiotic association of plant roots with fungi, represent another intimate interface between roots and rhizosphere microorganisms. It has been hypothesized that elevated atmospheric CO₂ will result in increased mycorrhizal colonization of plant roots (Luxmoore, 1981; Lamborg *et al.*, 1983), which in turn will increase plant productivity. Mycorrhizae increase nutrient uptake by their host plants (Abbott & Robson, 1984) and may even increase nutrient availability in some soils (Graustein *et al.*, 1977). Mycorrhizae can also provide additional water to plants through hyphal proliferation in soil (Luxmoore, 1981) which may, at least in part, explain the observed increase in biomass of CO₂-enriched plants under drought stress. Mycorrhizae will affect plant health by protecting roots from pathogenic microorganisms (Marx, 1973). Carbon dioxide enrichment has increased mycorrhizal colonization of roots of shortleaf pine (Norby *et al.*, 1987; O'Neill *et al.*, 1987b) and white oak (O'Neill *et al.*, 1987b).

The effects of CO₂ on nitrogen-fixing bacteria and mycorrhizal fungi are mediated through plants, primarily by altering rhizodeposition (the release of cells, exudates, mucilages, and other compounds into the rhizosphere by plant roots). In a historical review on the subject, Börner (1960) stated it has been known for some time that roots exude materials into the rhizosphere. There have recently been several excellent reviews on this topic (Newman, 1985; Whipps & Lynch, 1985; Curl & Truelove, 1986; Vancura, 1988; Whipps, 1990); however, relatively little is known concerning the effects of elevated atmospheric CO₂ on rhizodeposition. Van Veen *et al.* (1991) pointed to the paucity of data concerning the effects of CO₂ on carbon fluxes in plant-soil systems and speculated that increased plant biomass production under high CO₂ may lead to increased carbon inputs and increased microbial activity in the rhizosphere. Whipps (1985) found that the percentage of root-translocated carbon released from maize roots was not significantly affected by CO₂ concentration. However, Norby *et al.* (1987) found that exudation of soluble, ¹⁴C-labeled compounds from shortleaf pine seedling roots was greater in plants growing in CO₂-enriched air for up to 34 weeks. Finally, Lekkerkerk *et al.* (1990) reported increases in carbon transported to all parts of the plant-soil system, including carbon lost through root exudation and soil/root respiration, proportional to the increase in photosynthetic fixation of carbon by plants at higher CO₂ levels. They also report that significantly more ¹⁴CO₂ was respired and a lower percentage of ¹⁴C was retained in the roots of plants under elevated CO₂ when examined as a percentage of the amount of ¹⁴C being translocated to the roots. Effects of elevated CO₂ on rhizosphere deposition may have important implications to the development of rhizosphere biota (Curl & Harper, 1990; Lynch, 1990) including disease suppression (Curl, 1988). However, little attention has been paid to this aspect of plant development.

Effects of CO₂ on rhizodeposition will drive changes in root-soil microbial composition and activity which will affect not only nitrogen-fixing bacteria and mycorrhizal fungi but also pathogenic and nutrient cycling microbes. Changes in the concentration of CO₂ in the soil are known to affect soil microorganisms (Gardner & Hendrix, 1973; Ioannou *et al.*, 1977), but data on the effects of elevated atmospheric CO₂ on soil-borne pathogens and on root diseases are virtually non-existent. Freckman *et al.* (1991) found no effect on nematode numbers or species composition when exposing cores of prairie soil to elevated atmospheric CO₂. However, Runion *et al.* (1993) observed a trend toward decreasing numbers of parasitic nematodes in root-zone soil of cotton plants grown under high CO₂. They also reported a trend for increased populations of *Rhizoctonia solani*, a cotton root pathogen, but observed no corresponding increase in cotton root disease in a bioassay using root-zone soil from high CO₂ grown plants.

Microbes are responsible for the cycling of nutrients in soils and impacts of increasing CO₂, both on biomass production and on microbial composition and activity, will affect cycling processes. Luxmoore *et al.* (1986) observed increased nutrient retention in the plant-soil system of Virginia pine under high CO₂, but did not determine if this was due to increased plant uptake and/or increased incorporation in microbial biomass. O'Neill *et al.* (1987a) found an increase in total nitrogen and phosphorus uptake by yellow poplar seedlings under high CO₂ even though nitrite-oxidizing and phosphate-dissolving bacteria in the rhizosphere were reduced at the final harvest. They speculated that the decline in populations of bacteria was a function of decreased nutrient availability as competition with seedling roots increased during the growing season. Dehydrogenase activity, a measure of microbial respiration, was significantly higher in soils from CO₂-enriched cotton plants, but no appreciable differences in microbial populations (fungi, bacteria, and actinomycetes) were observed (Runion *et al.*, 1993).

Influences of atmospheric CO₂ on plants (carbon input and C:N ratio) and on soil microbes (composition and activity) will also impact carbon turnover and storage in soils. Lamborg *et al.* (1983) speculated that increased carbon input from increased biomass would lead to increased decomposition of organic matter and, thus, elevated atmospheric CO₂ would not result in accumulation of carbon in soil. Alternatively, Goudriaan and de Ruiter (1983) proposed that, due to preference of soil microbes for easily decomposable root-derived materials (rhizodeposition), increased level of CO₂ would retard decomposition of native soil organic matter and result in an accumulation of soil carbon. The debate remains unresolved, but studies are beginning to address this important issue. Mellilo (1983) reported higher C:N ratios and higher levels of phenolics in sweetgum leaves exposed to high CO₂ and hypothesized that this would result in reduced rates of decomposition and decreased soil fertility. Lekkerkerk *et al.* (1990) found the input of easily decomposable root-derived material

in the soil of wheat plants was increased and, due to microbial preference for these materials, turnover of more resistant soil organic matter was reduced under elevated CO₂. Couëteux *et al.* (1991) demonstrated similar results for an initial decomposition period and related the reduction in decomposition rate to lower nitrogen concentration and higher C:N ratios of CO₂-enriched plants. However, when they allowed decomposition to continue, changes in the composition of the decomposer population (increase in microfauna and introduction of white-rot fungi) resulted in an increased decomposition rate of CO₂-enriched material while the rate for control materials declined. These shifts in decomposer composition led to an overall enhancement of carbon mineralization of 30% for CO₂-enriched material. An increase in carbon turnover was also observed in soils which had supported CO₂-enriched cotton plants for three seasons (Wood *et al.*, 1993) and could be related to increases in soil microfauna and saprophagous nematode populations (Runion *et al.*, 1993).

There is little doubt that increasing levels of atmospheric CO₂, along with other potential effects of global change, will impact soils and soil resources. This issue is beginning to receive serious attention (Arnold *et al.*, 1990; Bouwman, 1990; Buol *et al.*, 1990; Hatfield, 1990; Sombroek, 1990; Schlesinger, 1991) that must be continued.

FUTURE RESEARCH TARGETS

General research recommendations have been outlined by various authors (Strain & Cure, 1985; Mooney, 1991; Rogers & Dahlman, 1993). The research community has been repeatedly urged to explore root, rhizosphere, and soil phenomena. But what are the priority belowground targets? Since so little definitive work has been completed, unknowns cannot be delineated with certainty. As specific points from which to start, we propose the following *hypotheses* as objectives of future research.

Hypothesis 1. Exposure of plants to elevated atmospheric CO₂ will induce root proliferation and this in turn will accelerate bedrock weathering and consequently affect the rate of soil genesis.

Hypothesis 2. Plant (including root) growth stimulated by high CO₂ will lead to a slowing of soil erosion.

Hypothesis 3. Rhizosphere population composition and dynamics will be stimulated and altered under plants growing in high CO₂ atmospheres.

Hypothesis 4. The quality of plant tissue (roots, stems, leaves, and reproductive parts), especially in natural ecosystems, will be altered (e.g. C:N ratios) by extra CO₂ leading to changes in the rate of decomposition and an alteration in soil biological dynamics, especially carbon flux.

Hypothesis 5. Changes in root system architecture (i.e. root depth densities) of plants growing under

enhanced CO₂ conditions will change the distribution of carbon in the soil profile.

Hypothesis 6. Atmospheric CO₂-induced differences in root tissue quality, rhizodeposition, and the rhizosphere will lead to either more or less susceptibility to root pathogens.

Hypothesis 7. Root growth patterns, if different at increased CO₂ concentrations, mean that water absorption from the soil profile will be different.

Hypothesis 8. Nutrient mining of the soil profile by root systems (of plants whose growth has been improved by CO₂ enrichment) will be affected.

Hypothesis 9. Root nutrient uptake kinetics (i.e. rate constants) will change under conditions of high CO₂ as a result of not only rhizographical alterations but also differences in root tissue characteristics.

Hypothesis 10. Shifts in litter quality and quantity, rhizodeposition, enhanced and altered microbial activity, and water/nutrient sorption patterns brought about by additional aerial CO₂ will lead to changes in soil physical properties such as structure, aggregation, and strength.

Hypothesis 11. If mineralization including N-fixation increases along with rising CO₂, many plant systems will respond with increased growth.

Hypothesis 12. Rhizodeposition will increase, and types and amounts of organic and inorganic chemicals released from roots of plants under high CO₂ conditions will change.

Hypothesis 13. Stimulation of very early seedling root growth by CO₂ enrichment will mean better establishment, and thus better survival, of crops.

Hypothesis 14. Root competition among species will be altered if CO₂ concentration increases.

Hypothesis 2.5. Enhanced rooting brought about by elevated CO₂ will lead to better plant growth under the impact of edaphic stress factors such as soil compaction.

These *hypotheses* represent major unknowns. We believe they should be tested.

CONCLUSION

Warnings of global change abound, and rightfully they should. Nevertheless, many agricultural researchers are optimistic, perhaps revealing their kinship with farmers. Certainly natural ecosystems and our soil, water, and air resources must be protected, but first mankind must be fed, fed from an agriculture which thrives or flounders upon environmentally derived inputs. Strategies designed to assure future world food security in a changing global environment must include a consideration of crop responses to elevated atmospheric CO₂. Regarding global change and the world food supply, Paul Erhlich put it this way, 'Enormous attention should be paid to agriculture, and it's just not happening' (Moffat, 1992). Certainly the resource base upon which all food production depends must be closely monitored within the framework of the greatest experi-

ment in history. Our well-being and our economic welfare really depend upon both natural and agricultural plant systems, systems that are tuned to the influx of atmospheric CO₂ and changes in related factors.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, L. K & Robson, A. D. (1984). The effect of VA mycorrhizae on plant growth. In *VA Mycorrhiza*, ed. C. L. Powell & D. J. Bagyaraj. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, pp. 113-30.
- Acocck, B. (1990). Effects of CO₂ on photosynthesis, plant growth and other processes. In *Impact of CO₂, Trace Gases, & Climate Change on Global Agriculture*, ed. B. A. Kimball, N. J. Rosenberg & L. H. Allen, Jr. ASA Special Publication No. 53, American Society of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, pp. 45-60.
- Acocck, B. & Allen, L. H., Jr. (1985). Crop responses to elevated carbon dioxide concentrations. In *Direct Effects of Increasing Carbon Dioxide on Vegetation*, ed. B. R. Strain & J. D. Cure. DOE/ER-0238, Office of Energy Research, US Dept. of Energy, Washington, DC, pp. 53-97.
- Akey, D. H. & Kimball, B. A. (1989). Growth and development of the beet armyworm on cotton grown in an enriched carbon dioxide atmosphere. *Southwestern Entomol.*, **14**, 255-60.
- Akin, D. E., Kimball, B. A., Mauney, J. R., LaMorte, R. L., Hendrey, G. R., Lewin, K., Nagy, J. & Gates, R. N. (1993). Influence of enhanced CO₂ concentration and irrigation on sudan grass digestibility. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* (in press).
- Allen, L. H., Jr. (1990). Plant responses to rising carbon dioxide and potential interactions with air pollutants. *J. Environ. Qual.*, **19**, 15-34.
- Allen, L. H., Jr. (1993). Carbon dioxide increase: Direct impacts on crops and indirect effects mediated through environmental changes. In *Physiology and Determination of Crop Yield*, ed. K. J. Boote, T. R. Sinclair & J. M. Bennett. ASA, CSSA, SSSA, Madison, Wisconsin. (In press).
- Allen, L. H., Jr, Vu, J. C. V., Valle, R. R., Boote, K. J. & Jones, P. H. (1988). Nonstructural carbohydrates and nitrogen of soybean grown under carbon dioxide enrichment. *Crop. Sci.*, **28**, 84-94.
- Allen, L. H., Jr, Bisbal, E. C., Campbell, W. J. & Boote, K. J. (1990a). Carbon dioxide effects on soybean developmental stages and expansive growth. *Soil & Crop Sci. Soc. Fla. Proc.*, **49**, 124-31.
- Allen, L. H., Jr, Valle, R. R., Mishoe, J. W., Jones, J. W. & Jones, P. H. (1990b). Soybean leaf gas exchange responses to CO₂ enrichment. *Soil & Crop Sci. Soc. Fla. Proc.*, **49**, 192-8.
- Allen, L. H., Jr, Bisbal, E. C., Boote, K. J. & Jones, P. H. (1991). Soybean dry matter allocation under subambient and superambient levels of carbon dioxide. *Agron. J.*, **83**, 875-83.
- Allen, L. H., Jr, Drake, B. G., Rogers, H. H. & Shinn, J. H. (1993). Field techniques for exposure of plants to CO₂. In *Free-Air CO₂ Enrichment for Plant Research in the Field*, ed. G. R. Hendrey. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Amthor, J. S. (1988). Growth and maintenance respiration in leaves of bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) exposed to ozone in open-top chambers in the field. *New Phytol.*, **110**, 319-25.
- Amthor, J. S. (1989). *Respiration and Crop Productivity*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 215 pp.
- Amthor, J. S. (1991). Respiration in a future, higher-CO₂ world. *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **14**, 13-20.
- Apel, P. (1989). Influence of CO₂ on stomatal numbers. *Biol. Plant.*, **31**, 724.
- Arnold, R. W., Szabolcs, I. & Targulian, V. O. (eds) (1990). *Global Soil Change: Report of an IIASA-ISSS-UNEP Task*

- Force on the Role of Soil in Global Change.** International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria, 110 pp.
- Arnone, J. A., III & Gordon, J. C. (1990). Effect of nodulation, nitrogen fixation and CO₂ enrichment on the physiology, growth and dry mass allocation of seedlings of *Alnus rubra* Bong. *New Phytol.*, **116**, 55-66.
- Arp, W. J. (1991). Effects of source-sink relations on photosynthetic acclimation to elevated CO₂. *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **14**, 869-875.
- Bacastow, R. B., Keeling, C. D. & Whorf, T. P. (1985). Seasonal amplitude increase in atmospheric concentration at Mauna Loa, Hawaii, 1959-1982. *J. Geophys. Res.*, **90**, 10529-10540.
- Baker, J. T. & Allen, L. H., Jr. (1993). Contrasting crop species responses to CO₂ and temperature: Rice, soybean and citrus. *Vegetatio*, **104/105**, 239-260.
- Baker, J. T., Allen, L. H., Jr. & Boote, K. J. (1990a). Growth and yield responses of rice to carbon dioxide concentration. *J. Agric. Sci.*, **115**, 313-320.
- Baker, J. T., Allen, L. H., Jr, Boote, K. J., Jones, P. & Jones, J. W. (1990b). Developmental responses of rice to photoperiod and carbon dioxide concentration. *Agric. & For. Meteorol.*, **50**, 201-210.
- Baker, J. T., Allen, L. H., Jr, Boote, K. J., Jones, P. & Jones, J. W. (1990c). Rice photosynthesis and evapotranspiration in subambient, ambient, and superambient carbon dioxide concentrations. *Agron. J.*, **82**, 834-840.
- Bazzaz, F. A. (1990). The response of natural ecosystems to the rising global CO₂ levels. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*, **21**, 167-196.
- Bazzaz, F. A. & Fajer, E. D. (1992). Plant life in a CO₂-rich world. *Sci. Am.*, **266**, 68-74.
- Bazzaz, F. A., Garbutt, K. & Williams, W. E. (1985). The Effect of Elevated Atmospheric CO₂ on Plant Communities TRO23.DOE/EV/4329-5, Office of Energy Research. US Dept. of Energy, Washington, DC, 39 pp.
- Bazzaz, F. A., Coleman, J. S. & Morse, S. R. (1990). Growth response of seven major co-occurring tree species of the northeastern United States to elevated CO₂. *Can. J. For. Res.*, **20**, 1479-84.
- Besford, R. T., Ludwig, L. J. & Withers, A. C. (1990). The greenhouse effect: Acclimation of tomato plants growing in high CO₂, photosynthesis and ribulose-1, 5-bisphosphate carboxylase protein. *J. Exp. Bot.*, **41**, 925-931.
- Bhattacharya, N. C. (1993). Prospects of agriculture in a carbon dioxide-enriched environment. In *A Global Warming Forum: Science, Economic, and Legal Overview*, ed. R. A. Geyer. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Bhattacharya, N. C., Biswas, P. K., Bhattacharya, S., Sionit, N. & Strain, B. R. (1985). Growth and yield response of sweet potato to atmospheric CO₂ enrichment. *Crop Sci.*, **25**, 975-981.
- Bhattacharya, N. C., Bhattacharya, S. & Strain, B. R. (1989a). Isozyme polymorphism during rooting at elevated CO₂. *Hort. Sci.*, **24**, 302-5.
- Bhattacharya, N. C., Bhattacharya, S., Strain, B. R. & Biswas, P. K. (1989b). Biochemical changes in carbohydrates and proteins of sweet potato plants (*Ipomoea batatas* [L.] Lam.) in response to enriched CO₂ environments at different stages of growth and development. *J. Plant Physiol.*, **135**, 261-6.
- Bhattacharya, N. C., Hileman, D. R., Ghosh, P. P. & Musser, R. L. (1990). Interaction of enriched CO₂ and water stress on the physiology of and biomass production in sweet potato grown in open-top chambers. *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **13**, 933-40.
- Bhattacharya, S., Bhattacharya, N. C. & Strain, B. R. (1985a). Rooting of sweet potato stem cuttings under CO₂-enriched environment and with IAA treatment. *Hort. Sci.*, **20**, 1109-10.
- Bhattacharya, S., Bhattacharya, N. C., Biswas, P. K. & Strain, B. R. (1985b). Response of cow pea (*Vigna unguiculata* L.) to CO₂ enrichment environment on growth, dry-matter production and yield components at different stages of vegetative and reproductive growth. *J. Agric. Sci.*, **105**, 527-34.
- Black, C. C., Jr. (1986). Effects of CO₂ concentration on photosynthesis and respiration of C₄ and CAM plants. In *Carbon Dioxide Enrichment of Greenhouse Crops, Vol. II—Physiology, Yield, and Economics*, ed. H. Z. Enoch & B. A. Kimball. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, pp. 2940.
- Boden, T. A., Sepanski, R. J. & Stoss, F. W. (eds) (1991). *Trends '91: A Compendium of Data on Global Change*. ORNL/CIDAC-46, US Dept. of Energy, Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 665 pp.
- Bolin, B., Doos, B. R., Jager, J. & Warrick, R. A. (1986). *Scope 29-The Greenhouse Effect, Climatic Change, and Ecosystems*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 541 pp.
- Börner, H. (1960). Liberation of organic substances from higher plants and their role in the soil sickness problem. *Bot. Rev.*, **26**, 393-424.
- Bottomley, P. A., Rogers, H. H. & Prior, S. A. (1993). Altered water-transport in *Vicia faba* L. roots due to elevated atmospheric CO₂ detected by in situ NMR imaging. *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **16**, 335-8.
- Bouwman, A. F. (ed.) (1990). *Soils and the Greenhouse Effect*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 567 pp.
- Bowes, G. (1991). Growth at elevated CO₂: Photosynthetic responses mediated through Rubisco. *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **14**, 795-806.
- Bowman, W. D. & Strain, B. R. (1987). Interaction between CO₂ enrichment and salinity stress in the C₄ non-halophyte *Andropogon glomeratus* (Walter) BSP. *Plant Cell & Environ.*, **10**, 267-70.
- Brown, K. & Higginbotham, K. O. (1986). Effects of carbon dioxide enrichment and nitrogen supply on growth of boreal tree seedlings. *Tree Physiol.*, **2**, 223-32.
- Brun, W. A. & Cooper, R. L. (1967). Response of soybeans to a carbon dioxide-enriched atmosphere. *Crop Sci.*, **7**, 455-567.
- Bunce, J. (1990). Short- and long-term inhibition of respiratory carbon dioxide efflux by elevated carbon dioxide. *Ann. Bot.*, **65**, 637-42.
- Bunce, J. A. & Caulfield, F. (1990). Reduced respiratory carbon dioxide efflux during growth at elevated carbon dioxide in three herbaceous perennial species. *Ann. Bot.*, **67**, 325-30.
- Buol, S. W., Sanchez, P. A., Kimble, J. M. & Weed, S. B. (1990). Predicted impact of climate warming on soil properties and use. In *Impact of Carbon Dioxide, Trace Gases, and Climate Change on Global Agriculture*, ed. B. A. Kimball, N. J. Rosenberg & L. H. Allen. Jr. ASA Special Publication No. 53, Am. Soc. Agron., Madison, Wisconsin, pp. 71-82.
- Calvert, A. (1972). Effects of day and night temperatures and carbon dioxide enrichment on yield of glasshouse tomatoes. *J. Hort. Sci.*, **47**, 231-47.
- Campagna, M. A. & Margolis, H. A. (1989). Influence of short-term atmospheric CO₂ enrichment on growth, allocation patterns, and biochemistry of black spruce seedlings at different stages of development. *Can. J. For. Res.*, **19**, 773-782.
- Caporn, S. J. M. (1989). The effects of oxides of nitrogen and carbon dioxide on photosynthesis and growth of lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L.). *New Phytol.*, **111**, 473-81.
- Carlson, R. W. & Bazzaz, F. A. (1980). The effects of elevated CO₂ concentrations on growth, photosynthesis, transpiration, and water use efficiency of plants. In *Environmental and Climatic Impact of Coal Utilization*, ed. J. J. Singh & A. Deepak. Academic Press, New York, pp. 609-922.

- Carlson, R. W. & Bazzaz, F. A. (1982). Photosynthetic and growth response to fumigation with SO₂ at elevated CO₂ for C₃ and C₄ plants. *Oecologia*, **54**, 50–4.
- Carter, D. R. & Peterson, K. M. (1983). Effects of a CO₂-enriched atmosphere on the growth and competitive interaction of a C₃ and a C₄ grass. *Oecologia*, **58**, 188–93.
- Cave, G., Tolley, L. C. & Strain, B. R. (1981). Effect of carbon dioxide enrichment on chlorophyll content, starch content and starch grain structure in *Trifolium subterraneum* leaves. *Physiol. Plant.*, **51**, 171–4.
- Chaudhuri, U. N., Burnett, R. B., Kirkham, M. B. & Kanemasu, E. T. (1986). Effect of carbon dioxide on sorghum yield, root growth, and water use. *Agric. & For. Meteorol.*, **37**, 109–22.
- Chaudhuri, U. N., Kirkham, M. B. & Kanemasu, E. T. (1990). Root growth of winter wheat under elevated carbon dioxide and drought. *Crop Sci.*, **30**, 853–7.
- Chen, J. J. & Sung, J. M. (1990). Gas exchange rate and yield responses of Virginia-type peanut to carbon dioxide enrichment. *Crop Sci.*, **30**, 1085–9.
- Clough, J. M. & Peet, M. M. (1981). Effects of intermittent exposure to high atmospheric CO₂ on vegetative growth in soybean. *Physiol. Plant.*, **53**, 565–9.
- Coûteaux, M.-M., Mousseau, M., Célérier, M.-L. & Bottner, P. (1991). Increased atmospheric CO₂ and litter quality: Decomposition of sweet chestnut leaf litter with animal food webs of different complexities. *Oikos*, **61**, 54–64.
- Cummings, M. B. & Jones, C. H. (1918). The aerial fertilization of plants with carbon dioxide. *Vermont Agric. Exp. Sta. Bull.*, **211**, 56 pp.
- Cure, J. D. & Acock, B. (1986). Crop responses to carbon dioxide doubling: A literature survey. *Agric. & For. Meteorol.*, **38**, 127–45.
- Cure, J. D., Rufty, T. W., Jr & Israel, D. W. (1987). Assimilate utilization in the leaf canopy and whole-plant growth of soybean during acclimation to elevated CO₂. *Bot. Gaz.*, **148**, 67–72.
- Cure, J. D., Israel, D. W. & Rufty, T. W., Jr. (1988a). Nitrogen stress effects on growth and seed yield of nonnodulated soybean exposed to elevated carbon dioxide. *Crop Sci.*, **28**, 671–7.
- Cure, J. D., Rufty, T. W., Jr & Israel, D. W. (1988b). Phosphorus stress effects on growth and seed yield responses of nonnodulated soybean exposed to elevated carbon dioxide. *Agron. J.*, **80**, 897–902.
- Cure, J. D., Rufty, T. W., Jr & Israel, D. W. (1989). Alterations in soybean leaf development and photosynthesis in a CO₂-enriched atmosphere. *Bot. Gaz.*, **150**, 337–45.
- Cure, J. D., Rufty, T. W., Jr & Israel, D. W. (1991). Assimilate relations in source and sink leaves during acclimation to a CO₂-enriched atmosphere. *Physiol. Plant.*, **83**, 687–95.
- Curl, E. A. (1988). The role of soil microfauna in plant-disease suppression. *CRC Critical Reviews in Plant Science*, **7**, 175–96. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Curl, E. & Harper, J. D. (1990). Fauna-microflora interactions. In *The Rhizosphere*, ed. J. M. Lynch. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, pp. 369–88.
- Curl, E. A. & Truelove, B. T. (1986). *The Rhizosphere*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 288 pp.
- Curry, R. B., Peart, R. M., Jones, J. W., Boote, K. J. & Allen, L. H., Jr (1990). Response of crop yield to predicted changes in climate and atmospheric CO₂ using simulation. *Trans. ASAE*, **33**, 1383–9.
- Curtis, P. S., Balduman, L. M., Drake, B. G. & Whigham, D. F. (1990). Elevated atmospheric CO₂ effects on below-ground processes in C₃ and C₄ estuarine marsh communities. *Ecology*, **71**, 2001–6.
- Dahlman, R. C. (1993). CO₂ and plants: Revisited. *Vegetatio*, **104/105**, 339–55.
- Davis, T. D. & Potter, J. R. (1982). Effects of CO₂ enrichment during the rooting of pea cuttings. *Hort. Sci.*, **17**, 579 (Abstr.).
- Davis, T. D. & Potter, J. R. (1983). High CO₂ applied to cuttings: Effects on rooting and subsequent growth in ornamental species. *Hort. Sci.*, **18**, 194–6.
- Del Castillo, D., Acock, B., Reddy, V. R. & Acock, M. C. (1989). Elongation and branching of roots on soybean plants in a carbon dioxide-enriched aerial environment. *Agron. J.*, **81**, 692–5.
- Delucia, E. H., Sasek, T. W. & Strain, B. R. (1985). Photosynthesis inhibition after long-term exposure to elevated levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide. *Photo. Res.*, **7**, 175–84.
- Desjardins, Y., Gosselin, A. & Yelle, S. (1987). Acclimatization of *ex vitro* strawberry plantlets in CO₂-enriched environments and supplementary lighting. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, **112**, 846–51.
- Desjardins, Y., Gosselin, A. & Lamarre, M. (1990). Growth of transplants and *in vitro*-cultured clones of asparagus in response to CO₂ enrichment and supplementary lighting. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, **115**, 364–8.
- Dommergues, Y. R. (1978). The plant-microorganism system. In *Interactions Between Non-pathogenic Soil Microorganisms and Plants*, ed. Y. R. Dommergues & S. V. Krupa. Elsevier Scientific Publishing Co., The Netherlands, pp. 1–37.
- Downton, W. J. S., Grant, W. J. R. & Loveys, B. R. (1987). Carbon dioxide enrichment increases yield of Valencia oranges. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, **14**, 493–501.
- Drake, B. G. (1992). The impact of rising CO₂ on ecosystem production. *Water, Air & Soils Pollut.*, **64**, 25–44.
- Drake, B. G., Rogers, H. H. & Allen, L. H., Jr (1985). Methods of exposing plants to elevated CO₂ concentrations. In *Direct Effects of CO₂ on Vegetation*, ed. B. R. Strain & J. D. Cure. DOE/ER-0238, Office of Energy Research, US Dept. of Energy, Washington, DC, pp. 11–31.
- Du Cloux, H. C., André, M., Daguenet, A. & Massimino, J. (1987). Wheat responses to CO₂ enrichment: Growth and CO₂ exchange at two plant densities. *J. Exp. Bot.*, **38**, 1421–31.
- Eamus, D. & Jarvis, P. G. (1989). The direct effects of increase in the global atmospheric CO₂ concentration on natural and commercial temperate trees and forests. *Adv. Ecol. Res.*, **19**, 1–55.
- Enoch, H. Z. (1990). Crop responses to aerial carbon dioxide. *Acta Hort.*, **268**, 17–29.
- Enoch, H. Z. & Zieslin, N. (1988). Growth and development of plants in response to carbon dioxide concentrations. *Appl. Agric. Res.*, **3**, 248–56.
- Fajer, E. D., Bowers, M. D. & Bazzaz, F. A. (1989). The effects of enriched carbon dioxide atmospheres on plant-insect herbivore interactions. *Science*, **243**, 1198–200.
- Fajer, E. D., Bowers, M. D. & Bazzaz, F. A. (1991). Performance and allocation patterns of the perennial herb, *Plantago lanceolata*, in response to simulated herbivory and elevated CO₂ environments. *Oecologia*, **87**, 37–42.
- Farrar, J. F. (1981). Respiration rate of barley roots: Its relation to growth, substrate supply and the illumination of the shoot. *Ann. Bot.*, **48**, 53–63.
- Farrar, J. F. (1985). The respiratory source of CO₂. *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **8**, 427–38.
- Finn, G. A. & Brun, W. A. (1982). Effect of atmospheric CO₂ enrichment on growth, nonstructural carbohydrate content, and root nodule activity in soybean. *Plant Physiol.*, **69**, 327–31.
- Ford, M. A. & Thorne, G. N. (1967). Effect of CO₂ concentration on growth of sugar beet, barley, kale, and maize. *Ann. Bot.*, **31**, 629–44.
- Freckman, D. W., Moore, J. C., Hunt, H. W. & Elliott, E. T. (1991). The effects of elevated CO₂ and climate change on soil nematode community structure of prairie sod. *Bull. Ecol. Soc. Amer.*, **72** (2 Suppl.), 119 (Abstr.).
- French, C. J. (1989). Propagation and subsequent growth of

- Rhododendron* cuttings: Varied response to CO₂ enrichment and supplementary lighting. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, **114**, 251–9.
- French, C. J. & Alsbury, J. (1989). Supplementary lighting and CO₂ mist influence rooting of *Camellia japonica*. *Hort. Sci.*, **24**, 452–4.
- Garbutt, K., Williams, W. E. & Bazzaz, F. A. (1990). Analysis of the differential response of five annuals to elevated CO₂ during growth. *Ecology*, **71**, 1185–94.
- Gardner, D. E. & Hendrix, F. F., Jr (1973). Carbon dioxide and oxygen concentrations in relation to survival and saprophytic growth of *Pythium irregulare* and *Pythium vexans* in soil. *Can. J. Bot.*, **51**, 1593–8.
- Gastal, F. & Saugier, B. (1989). Relationships between nitrogen uptake and carbon assimilation in whole plants of tall fescue. *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **12**, 407–18.
- Geethakumari, V. L. & Shivashankar, K. (1991). Studies on organic amendment and CO₂ enrichment in ragi/soybean intercropping systems. *Indian J. Agron.*, **36**, 202–6.
- Gifford, R. M. (1977). Growth pattern, carbon dioxide exchange and dry weight distribution in wheat growing under differing photosynthetic environments. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, **4**, 99–100.
- Gifford, R. M. (1979). Growth and yield of CO₂-enriched wheat under water-limited conditions. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, **6**, 367–78.
- Gifford, R. M. (1988). Direct effects of higher carbon dioxide concentrations on vegetation. In *Greenhouse: Planning for Climate Change*. Papers presented at the Greenhouse 87 Conference, Monash Univ., Melbourne, Australia, 1987, pp. 506–19.
- Gifford, R. M. & Morison, J. I. L. (1985). Photosynthesis, water use and growth of a C₄ grass stand at high CO₂ concentration. *Photosyn. Res.*, **7**, 69–76.
- Gifford, R. M., Lambers, H. & Morison, J. I. L. (1985). Respiration of crop species under CO₂ enrichment. *Physiol. Plant.*, **63**, 351–6.
- Gislerød, H. R. & Nelson, P. V. (1989). The interaction of relative air humidity and carbon dioxide enrichment in the growth of *Chrysanthemum morifolium* Ramat. *Sci. Hort.*, **38**, 305–13.
- Goudriaan, J. & Bijlsma, R. J. (1987). Effect of CO₂ enrichment on growth of faba beans at two levels of water supply. *Neth. J. Agric. Sci.*, **35**, 189–91.
- Goudriaan, J. & de Ruiter, H. E. (1983). Plant growth in response to CO₂ enrichment, at two levels of nitrogen and phosphorus supply. I. Dry matter, leaf area and development. *Neth. J. Agric. Sci.*, **31**, 157–69.
- Goudriaan, J., Van Keulen, H. & Van Laar, H. H. (eds) (1990). *The Greenhouse Effect and Primary Productivity in European Agro-ecosystems*. Proc. International Workshop on Primary Productivity of European Agriculture and the Greenhouse Effect, Wageningen, the Netherlands, 5–10 April 1990, 90 pp.
- Graustein, W. C., Cromack, K., Jr & Sollins, P. (1977). Calcium oxalate: Occurrence in soils and effect on nutrient and geochemical cycles. *Science*, **198**, 1252–4.
- Hårdh, J. E. (1966). Trials with carbon dioxide, light and growth substances on forest tree plants. *Acta Forest. Fenn.*, **81**, 1–10.
- Hardy, R. W. F. & Havelka, U. D. (1973). Symbiotic N₂ fixation: Multifold enhancement by CO₂ enrichment of field-grown soybeans. *Plant Physiol.*, **48** (Suppl.), 35 (Abstr.).
- Hardy, R. W. F. & Havelka, U. D. (1977). Possible routes to increase the conversion of solar energy to food and feed by grain, legume and cereal crops (crop production): CO₂ and N₂ fixation, foliar fertilization, and assimilate partitioning. In *Biological Solar Energy Conversion*, ed. A. Mitsui, S. Miyachi, A. San Pietro, & S. Tamura. Academic Press, New York, pp. 299–322.
- Hatfield, J. L. (1990). Climate change and the potential impact on the soil resource. *J. Iowa Acad. Sci.*, **97**, 82–3.
- Havelka, U. D. & Hardy, R. W. F. (1976). N₂[C₂H₂] fixation, growth, and yield response of field-grown peanuts (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) when grown under ambient and 1500 ppm CO₂ in the foliar canopy. *Agron. Abstr.*, p. 72.
- Havelka, U. D., Wittenbach, V. A. & Boyle, M. G. (1984). CO₂-enrichment effects on wheat yield and physiology. *Crop Sci.*, **24**, 1163–8.
- Hayashi, M., Kozai, T., Watanabe, K. & Watanabe, I. (1990). Effects of CO₂ enrichment and high solar radiation on the growth of potato plantlets in direct ex-vitro rooting method. *Environ. Control Biol.*, **28**, 147–54.
- Hendrey, G. R. (1992). Personal communication. Dept. of Applied Science, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York.
- Herold, A. (1980). Regulation of photosynthesis by sink activity—the missing link. *New Phytol.*, **86**, 131–44.
- Higginbotham, K. O. (1983). Growth of white spruce (*Picea glauca* [Moench.] Voss) in elevated carbon dioxide environments. *Agric. For. Bull.*, **6**, 31–3.
- Higginbotham, K. O., Mayo, J. M., L'Hirondelle, S. & Krystofiak, D. K. (1985). Physiological ecology of lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*) in an enriched CO₂ environment. *Can. J. For. Res.*, **15**, 417–21.
- Hocking, P. J. & Meyer, C. P. (1985). Responses of Noogoora burr (*Xanthium occidentale* Bertol.) to nitrogen supply and carbon dioxide enrichment. *Ann. Bot.*, **55**, 835–44.
- Hocking, P. J. & Meyer, C. P. (1991). Effects of CO₂ enrichment and nitrogen stress on growth, and partitioning of dry matter and nitrogen in wheat and maize. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, **18**, 339–56.
- Hou, L., Hill, A. C. & Soleimani, A. (1977). Influence of CO₂ on the effects of SO₂ and NO₂ on alfalfa. *Environ. Pollut.*, **12**, 7–16.
- Houghton, J. T., Jenkins, G. J. & Ephraums, J. J. (eds) (1990). *Climate Change: The IPCC Scientific Assessment*. World Meteorological Organization, United Nations Environmental Programme, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 365 pp.
- Huber, S. C., Rogers, H. H. & Israel, D. W. (1984a). Effects of CO₂ enrichment on photosynthesis and photosynthate partitioning in soybean (*Glycine max*) leaves. *Physiol. Plant.*, **62**, 95–101.
- Huber, S. C., Rogers, H. H. & Mowry, F. L. (1984b). Effects of water stress on photosynthesis and carbon partitioning in soybean (*Glycine max* [L.] Merr.) plants grown in the field at different CO₂ levels. *Plant Physiol.*, **76**, 244–9.
- Hughes, A. P. & Cockshull, K. E. (1969). Effects of carbon dioxide concentration on the growth of *Callistephus chinensis* cultivar Johannistag. *Ann. Bot.*, **33**, 351–65.
- Hurd, R. G. (1968). Effects of CO₂ enrichment on the growth of young tomato plants in low light. *Ann. Bot.*, **32**, 531–42.
- Idso, S. B. (1989). *Carbon Dioxide and Global Change: Earth in Transition*. IBR Press, Tempe, Arizona, 292 pp.
- Idso, S. B. (1990). A role for soil microbes in moderating the carbon dioxide greenhouse effect. *Soil Sci.*, **149**, 179–80.
- Idso, S. B. & Kimball, B. A. (1991a). Doubling CO₂ triples growth rate of sour orange trees. Research Summary No. 13, US Dept. of Energy, Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 4 pp.
- Idso, S. B. & Kimball, B. A. (1991b). Effects of two and a half years of atmospheric CO₂ enrichment on the root density distribution of three-year-old sour orange trees. *Agric. & For. Meteorol.*, **55**, 345–9.
- Idso, S. B. & Kimball, B. A. (1992). Seasonal root growth of sour orange trees maintained in atmospheres of ambient and elevated CO₂ concentrations. *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **15**, 337–41.

- Idso, S. B., Kimball, B. A., Anderson, M. G. & Mauney, J. R. (1987). Effects of atmospheric CO₂ enrichment on plant growth: The interactive role of air temperature. *Agric. Ecosys. & Environ.*, **20**, 1–10.
- Idso, S. B., Kimball, B. A. & Mauney, J. R. (1988). Effects of atmospheric CO₂ enrichment on root:shoot ratios of carrot, radish, cotton and soybean. *Agric. Ecosys. & Environ.*, **21**, 293–9.
- Idso, S. B., Allen, S. G. & Kimball, B. A. (1990). Growth response of water lily to atmospheric CO₂ enrichment. *Aqua. Bot.*, **37**, 87–92.
- Imai, K. & Murata, Y. (1976). Effect of carbon dioxide concentration on growth and dry matter production in crop plants. *Proc. Crop Sci. Soc. Jap.*, **45**, 598–606.
- Imai, K., Coleman, D. F. & Yanagisawa, T. (1985). Increase in atmospheric partial pressure of carbon dioxide and growth and yield of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Jap. J. Crop Sci.*, **54**, 413–8.
- Ioannou, N., Schneider, R. W. & Grogan, R. G. (1977). Effect of oxygen, carbon dioxide, and ethylene on growth, sporulation, and production of microsclerotia by *Verticillium dahliae*. *Phytopathology*, **67**, 645–50.
- Israel, D. W., Rufty, T. W., Jr & Cure, J. D. (1990). Nitrogen and phosphorous nutritional interactions in a CO₂ enriched environment. *J. Plant Nutr.*, **13**, 1419–33.
- Ito, T. (1970). Absorption and distribution of radioactive phosphorus in tomato plant with respect to the carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere. Tech. Bull. No. 18, Faculty of Hort., Chiba Univ., pp. 21–8.
- Ito, T. (1972). Photosynthetic activity of vegetable plants and its horticultural significance. V. Effects of supplementary CO₂ or air movement upon the growth and yields of tomato and cucumber. *J. Japan. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, **41**, 42–50.
- Jarvis, P. G. (1989). Atmospheric carbon dioxide and forests. *Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. Lond.*, **324**, 369–92.
- Johnson, R. H. & Lincoln, D. E. (1991). Sagebrush carbon allocation patterns and grasshopper nutrition: The influence of CO₂ enrichment and soil mineral nutrition. *Oecologia*, **86**, 127–34.
- Jolliffe, P. A. & Ehret, D. L. (1985). Growth of bean plants at elevated carbon dioxide concentrations. *Can. J. Bot.*, **63**, 2021–5.
- Jones, P., Allen, L. H., Jr, Jones, J. W., Boote, K. J. & Campbell, W. J. (1984). Soybean canopy growth, photosynthesis, and transpiration responses to whole-season carbon dioxide enrichment. *Agron. J.*, **76**, 633–7.
- Jones, P., Allen, L. H., Jr & Jones, J. W. (1985). Responses of a soybean canopy, photosynthesis and transpiration to whole-day temperature changes in different CO₂ environments. *Agron. J.*, **77**, 242–9.
- Jones, R. J. & Mansfield, T. A. (1970). Increases in the diffusion resistances of leaves in a carbon dioxide-enriched atmosphere. *J. Exp. Bot.*, **21**, 951–8.
- Kaushal, P., Guehl, J. M. & Aussenac, G. (1989). Differential growth response to atmospheric carbon dioxide enrichment in seedlings of *Cedrus atlantica* and *Pinus nigra* ssp. *Laricio* var. *Corsicana*. *Can. J. For. Res.*, **19**, 1351–8.
- Keeling, C. D. (1983). The global carbon cycle: What we know and could know from atmospheric, biospheric and oceanic observations. CONF-820970, US, Dept. of Energy, Washington, DC, pp. II.3–II.62.
- Keeling, C. D., Bacastow, R. B., Carter, A. F., Piper, S. C., Whorf, T. P., Heimann, M., Mook, W. G. & Roeloffzen, H. (1989). A three dimensional model of atmospheric CO₂ transport based on observed winds: 1. Analysis of observational data. In *Aspects of Climate Variability in the Pacific and the Western Americas*, ed. D. H. Peterson. Geophys. Monogr. 55, American Geophysical Union, Washington, DC, pp. 165–236.
- Kimball, B. A. (1983a). Carbon dioxide and agricultural yield: An assemblage and analysis of 430 prior observations. *Agron. J.*, **75**, 779–88.
- Kimball, B. A. (1983b). Carbon dioxide and agricultural yield: An assemblage and analysis of 770 prior observations. WCL Report 14, US Dept. of Agric., Agric. Res. Serv., Phoenix, Arizona, 71 pp.
- Kimball, B. A. & Idso, S. B. (1983). Increasing atmospheric CO₂: Effects on crop yield, water use, and climate. *Agric. Water Man.*, **7**, 55–72.
- Kimball, B. A., Mauney, J. R., Nakayama, F. S. & Idso, S. B. (1989). Effects of CO₂ and changing climate variables on plants. In *Proc. 20th Annual Anniversary Meeting of Canada Grains Council*, Winnipeg, Canada, 4–5 April 1989 pp. 116–39.
- Kimball, B. A., Rosenberg, N. J. & Allen, L. H., Jr (eds) (1990). *Impact of CO₂, Trace Gases, and Climate Change on Global Agriculture*. ASA Special Publication No. 53, Am. Soc. Agron., Madison, Wisconsin, 133 pp.
- Kimball, B. A., Mauney, J. R., Nakayama, F. S. & Idso, S. B. (1993). Effects of increasing atmospheric CO₂ on vegetation. *Vegetatio*, **104–105**, 65–75.
- King, K. M. & Greer, D. H. (1986). Effects of carbon dioxide enrichment and soil water on maize. *Agron. J.*, **78**, 515–21.
- Knecht, G. N. (1975). Response of radish to high CO₂. *Hort. Sci.*, **10**, 274–5.
- Koch, K. E., White, D. W., Jones, J. P. & Allen, L. H. (1983). CO₂ enrichment of Carrizo citrange and Swingle citrumelo rootstocks. *Proc. Fla. State Hort. Soc.*, **96**, 37–40.
- Koch, K. E., Allen, L. H., Jr, Jones, P. & Avigne, W. T. (1987). Growth of citrus rootstock (*Carrizo citrange*) seedlings during and after long-term CO₂ enrichment. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, **112**, 77–82.
- Kohlmaier, G. H., Brohl, H., Sire, E. O. & Plochl, M. (1987). Modelling stimulation of plants and ecosystem response to present levels of excess atmospheric CO₂. *Tellus*, **39B**, 155–70.
- Kohlmaier, G. H., Sire, E. O. & Janeczek, A. (1989). Modelling the seasonal contribution of a CO₂ fertilization effect of the terrestrial vegetation to the amplitude increase in atmospheric CO₂ at Mauna Loa Observatory. *Tellus*, **41B**, 487–510.
- Kosuge, T. & Kimpel, J. A. (1981). Energy use and metabolic regulation in plant-pathogen interactions. In *Effects of Disease on the Physiology of the Growing Plant*, ed. P. G. Ayres. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 29–45.
- Kriedemann, P. E., Sward, R. J. & Downton, W. J. S. (1976). Vine response to carbon dioxide enrichment during heat therapy. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, **3**, 605–18.
- Krupa, S. V. & Kickert, R. N. (1989). The greenhouse effect: Impacts of ultraviolet-B (UV-B) radiation, carbon dioxide (CO₂), and ozone (O₃) on vegetation. *Environ. Pollut.*, **61**, 263–393.
- Kuchment, L. S. & Startseva, Z. P. (1991). Sensitivity of evapotranspiration and soil moisture in wheat fields to changes in climate and direct effects of carbon dioxide. *Hydrol. Sci. J.*, **36**, 631–44.
- Laforge, F., Lussier, C., Desjardins, Y. & Gosselin, A. (1991). Effect of light intensity and CO₂ enrichment during in-vitro rooting on subsequent growth of plantlets of strawberry, raspberry and asparagus in acclimatization. *Sci. Hort.*, **47**, 259–69.
- Lambers, H. (1985). Respiration in intact plants and tissues: Its regulation and dependence on environmental factors, metabolism and invaded organisms. In *Higher Plant Cell Respiration: Encyclopedia of Plant Physiology, New Series, Volume 18*, ed. R. Douce & D. A. Day. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, pp. 418–73.
- Lamborg, M. R., Hardy, R. W. F. & Paul, E. A. (1983). Microbial effects. In *CO₂ and Plants: The Response of Plants to Rising Levels of Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide*,

- ed. E. R. Lemon. AAAS Selected Symposium 84, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, pp. 131–76.
- Larigauderie, A., Hilbert, D. W. & Oechel, W. C. (1988). Effect of CO₂ enrichment and nitrogen availability on resource acquisition and resource allocation in a grass, *Bromus mollis*. *Oecologia*, **77**, 544–9.
- Leavitt, S. W., Paul, E. A., Kimball, B. A., Hendrey, G. R., Mauney, J., Rauschkolb, R., Rogers, H., Lewin, K., Nagy, J., Pinter, P. & Johnson, H. B. (1993). Carbon isotope dynamics of free-air CO₂ enriched cotton and soils. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* (Submitted).
- Lekkerkerk, L. J. A., Van de Geijn, S. C. & Van Veen, J. A. (1990). Effects of elevated atmospheric CO₂-levels on the carbon economy of a soil planted with wheat. In *Soils and the Greenhouse Effect*, ed. A. F. Bouwman. John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp. 423–9.
- Lemon, E. R. (ed.) (1983). *CO₂ and Plants: The Response of Plants to Rising Levels of Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide*. AAAS Selected Symposium 84, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, 280 pp.
- Lin, W. C. & Molnar, J. M. (1980). Carbonated mist and high intensity supplementary lighting for propagation of selected woody ornamentals. *Proc. Int. Plant Propag. Soc.*, **30**, 104–9.
- Lin, W. C. & Molnar, J. M. (1981). Effects of CO₂ mist and high intensity supplementary lighting on propagation of selected woody ornamentals. *Can. J. Plant Sci.*, **61**, 965–9.
- Lincoln, D. E., Sionit, N. & Strain, B. R. (1984). Growth and feeding responses of *Pseudoplusia includens* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) to host plants grown in controlled carbon dioxide atmospheres. *Environ. Entomol.*, **13**, 1527–30.
- Long, S. P. & Drake, B. G. (1992). Photosynthetic CO₂ assimilation and rising atmospheric CO₂ concentrations. In *Crop Photosynthesis: Spatial and Temporal Determinants*, ed. N. R. Baker & H. Thomas. Elsevier Science Publishers, Amsterdam, pp. 69–107.
- Luxmoore, R. J. (1981). CO₂ and Phytomass. *Biosci.*, **31**, 626.
- Luxmoore, R. J., O'Neill, E. G., Ells, J. M. & Rogers, H. H. (1986). Nutrient uptake and growth responses of Virginia pine to elevated atmospheric carbon dioxide. *J. Environ. Qual.*, **15**, 244–51.
- Lynch, J. M. (ed.) (1990). *The Rhizosphere*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, 458 pp.
- MacDowall, F. D. H. (1972). Growth kinetics of Marquis wheat. II. Carbon dioxide dependence. *Can. J. Bot.*, **50**, 883–9.
- MacDowall, F. D. H. (1982). Effects of light intensity and CO₂ concentration on the kinetics of 1st month growth and nitrogen fixation of alfalfa. *Can. J. Bot.*, **61**, 731–40.
- Marx, D. H. (1973). Mycorrhizae and feeder root diseases. In *Ectomycorrhizae: Their Ecology and Physiology*, ed. G. C. Marks & T. T. Kozlowski. Academic Press, New York, pp. 351–82.
- Masle, J., Farquhar, G. D. & Gifford, R. M. (1990). Growth and carbon economy of wheat seedlings as affected by soil resistance to penetration and ambient partial pressure of CO₂. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, **17**, 465–87.
- Masterson, C. L. & Sherwood, M. T. (1978). Some effects of increased atmospheric carbon dioxide on white clover (*Trifolium repens*) and pea (*Pisum sativum*). *Plant & Soil*, **49**, 421–6.
- Masuda, T., Fujita, K., Kogure, K. & Ogata, S. (1989). Effect of CO₂ enrichment and nitrate application on vegetative growth and dinitrogen fixation of wild and cultivated soybean varieties. *Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.*, **35**, 357–66.
- Mattson, R. H. & Widmer, R. E. (1971). Year round effects of carbon dioxide supplemented atmospheres on greenhouse rose (*Rosa hybrida*) production. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, **96**, 487–8.
- Mauney, J. R., Lewin, K., Hendrey, G. R. & Kimball, B. A. (1993). Responses of a cotton crop exposed to elevated CO₂ by the FACE arrays. In *Free-Air CO₂ Enrichment for Plant Research in the Field*, ed. G. R. Hendrey. CRC Press Inc., Boca Raton, Florida.
- Mellilo, J. M. (1983). Will increases in atmospheric CO₂ concentrations affect decay processes? *Ecosys. Center Ann. Rep.*, Marine Biol. Lab., Woods Hole, Massachusetts, pp. 10–11.
- Moe, R. (1977). Effect of light, temperature and CO₂ on the growth of *Campanula isophylla* stock plants and on the subsequent growth and development of their cuttings. *Sci. Hort.*, **6**, 129–41.
- Moffat, A. S. (1992). Does global change threaten the world food supply? *Science*, **256**, 1140–1.
- Molnar, J. M. & Cummings, W. A. (1968). Effect of carbon dioxide on propagation of softwood, conifer and herbaceous cuttings. *Can. J. Plant Sci.*, **48**, 595–9.
- Mooney, H. A. (1991). Biological response to climate change: An agenda for research. *Ecol. Appl.*, **1**, 112–7.
- Mooney, H. A., Drake, B. G., Luxmoore, R. J., Oechel, W. C. & Pitelka, L. F. (1991). Predicting ecosystem responses to elevated CO₂ concentrations. *BioSci.*, **41**, 96–104.
- Morison, J. I. L. (1985). Sensitivity of stomata and water use efficiency to high CO₂. *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **8**, 467–74.
- Morison, J. I. L. (1988). Effect of increasing atmospheric CO₂ on plants and their responses to other pollutants, climatic and soil factors. *Asp. Appl. Biol.*, **17**, 113–22.
- Morison, J. I. L. & Gifford, R. M. (1984a). Plant growth and water use with limited water supply in high CO₂ concentrations. I. Leaf area, water use and transpiration. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, **11**, 361–74.
- Morison, J. I. L. & Gifford, R. M. (1984b). Plant growth and water use with limited water supply in high CO₂ concentrations. II. Plant dry weight, partitioning and water use efficiency. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, **11**, 375–84.
- Mortensen, L. M. & Ulsaker, R. (1985). Effect of CO₂ concentration and light levels on growth, flowering and photosynthesis of *Begonia × hiemalis* fotsch. *Sci. Hort.*, **27**, 133–41.
- Mousseau, M. & Enoch, H. Z. (1989). Carbon dioxide enrichment reduces shoot growth in sweet chestnut seedlings (*Castanea sativa* Mill.). *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **12**, 927–34.
- Musgrave, M. E., Strain, B. R. & Siedow, J. N. (1986). Response of two pea hybrids to CO₂ enrichment: A test of the energy overflow hypothesis for alternative respiration. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **83**, 8157–61.
- Newman, E. I. (1985). The rhizosphere: Carbon sources and microbial populations. In *Ecological Interactions in Soil, Plants, Microbes and Animals*, ed. A. H. Fitter. Special Publication 4, British Ecological Society, Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, pp. 107–21.
- Newman, J. E. (1989). The direct and indirect impacts of climate change on crop production. In *Proceedings for Agricultural Science Centennial, Central Agric. Expt. Sta.*, Steinkjer, Norway, 9–11 August 1989, pp. 101–29.
- Newton, P. C. D. (1991). Direct effects of increasing carbon dioxide on pasture plants and communities. *New Zealand J. Agric. Res.*, **34**, 1–24.
- Nijs, I., Impens, I. & Behaeghe, T. (1989). Effects of long-term elevated atmospheric CO₂ concentration on *Lolium perenne* and *Trifolium repens* canopies in the course of a terminal drought stress period. *Can. J. Bot.*, **67**, 2720–5.
- Norby, R. J. (1987). Nodulation and nitrogenase activity in nitrogen-fixing woody plants stimulated by CO₂ enrichment of the atmosphere. *Physiol. Plant.*, **71**, 77–82.
- Norby, R. J. & O'Neill, E. G. (1989). Growth dynamics and water use of seedlings of *Quercus alba* L. in CO₂-enriched atmospheres. *New Phytol.*, **111**, 491–500.
- Norby, R. J., O'Neill, E. G. & Luxmoore, R. J. (1986a). Effects of atmospheric CO₂ enrichment on the growth and

- mineral nutrition of *Quercus alba* seedlings in a nutrient-poor soil. *Plant Physiol.*, **82**, 83–9.
- Norby, R. J., Pastor, J. & Melillo, J. M. (1986b). Carbon–nitrogen interactions in CO₂-enriched white oak: Physiological and long-term perspectives. *Tree Physiol.*, **2**, 233–41.
- Norby, R. J., O'Neill, E. G., Hood, W. G. & Luxmoore, R. J. (1987). Carbon allocation, root exudation and mycorrhizal colonization of *Pinus echinata* seedlings grown under CO₂ enrichment. *Tree Physiol.*, **3**, 203–10.
- Norby, R. J., Gunderson, C. A., Wullschlegel, S. D., O'Neill, E. G., & McCracken, M. K. (1992). Productivity and compensatory responses of yellow-poplar trees in elevated CO₂. *Nature*, **357**, 322–34.
- Oberbauer, S. F., Strain, B. R. & Fetcher, N. (1985). Effect of CO₂-enrichment on seedling physiology and growth of two tropical tree species. *Physiol. Plant.*, **65**, 352–6.
- Oberbauer, S. F., Sionit, N., Hastings, S. J. & Oechel, W. C. (1986). Effect of CO₂ enrichment and nutrition on growth, photosynthesis, and nutrient concentration of Alaskan tundra plant species. *Can. J. Bot.*, **64**, 2993–8.
- O'Neill, E. G., Luxmoore, R. J. & Norby, R. J. (1987a). Elevated atmospheric CO₂ effects on seedling growth, nutrient uptake, and rhizosphere bacterial populations of *Liriodendron tulipifera* L. *Plant & Soil*, **104**, 3–11.
- O'Neill, E. G., Luxmoore, R. J. & Norby, R. J. (1987b). Increases in mycorrhizal colonization and seedling growth in *Pinus echinata* and *Quercus alba* in an enriched CO₂ atmosphere. *Can. J. For. Res.*, **17**, 878–83.
- Osbrink, W. L. A., Trumble, J. T. & Wagner, R. E. (1987). Host suitability of *Phaseolus lunata* for *Trichoplusia ni* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in controlled carbon dioxide atmospheres. *Environ. Entomol.*, **16**, 639–44.
- Overdieck, D., Reid, C. & Strain, B. R. (1988). The effects of preindustrial and future CO₂ concentrations on growth, dry matter production and the C/N relationship in plants at low nutrient supply: *Vigna unguiculata* (cowpea), *Abelmoschus esculentus* (okra) and *Raphanus sativus* (radish). *Angew. Botanik*, **62**, 119–34.
- Owensby, C. E., Coyne, P. I., & Auen, L. M. (1993a). Nitrogen and phosphorus dynamics of a tallgrass prairie ecosystem exposed to elevated carbon dioxide. *Plant, Cell & Environ.* (In press).
- Owensby, C. E., Coyne, P. I., Ham, J. M., Auen, L. M. & Knapp, A. K. (1993b). Biomass production in a tallgrass prairie ecosystem exposed to ambient and elevated levels of CO₂. *Ecol. Appl.* (In press).
- Paez, A., Hellmers, H. & Strain, B. R. (1980). CO₂ effects on apical dominance in *Pisum sativum*. *Physiol. Plant.*, **50**, 43–6.
- Paez, A., Hellmers, H. & Strain, B. R. (1983). CO₂ enrichment, drought stress and growth of Alaska pea plants (*Pisum sativum*). *Physiol. Plant.*, **58**, 161–5.
- Paez, A., Hellmers, H. & Strain, B. R. (1984). Carbon dioxide enrichment and water stress interaction on growth of two tomato cultivars. *J. Agric. Sci.*, **102**, 687–93.
- Pastor, J. & Post, W. M. (1988). Response of northern forests to CO₂-induced climate change. *Nature*, **334**, 55–8.
- Patterson, D. T. (1986). Responses of soybean (*Glycine max*) and three C₄ weeds to CO₂ enrichment during drought. *Weed Sci.*, **34**, 203–10.
- Patterson, D. T. & Flint, E. P. (1980). Potential effects of global atmospheric CO₂ enrichment on the growth and competitiveness of C₃ and C₄ weed and crop plants. *Weed Sci.*, **28**, 71–5.
- Patterson, D. T. & Flint, E. P. (1982). Interacting effects CO₂ and nutrient concentration. *Weed Sci.*, **30**, 389–94.
- Patterson, D. T. & Flint, E. P. (1990). Implications of increasing CO₂ and climate change for plant communities and competition in natural and managed ecosystems. In *Impact of CO₂, Trace Gases, and Climate Change on Global Agriculture*, ed. B. A. Kimball, N. J. Rosenberg & L. H. Allen, Jr. ASA Special Publication, Am. Soc. Agron., Madison, Wisconsin, pp. 83–110.
- Patterson, D. T., Flint, E. P. & Beyers, J. L. (1984). Effects of CO₂ enrichment on competition between a C₄ weed and a C₃ crop. *Weed Sci.*, **32**, 101–5.
- Patterson, D. T., Highsmith, M. T. & Flint, E. P. (1988). Effects of temperature and CO₂ concentration on the growth of cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*), spurred anoda (*Anoda cristata*), and velvetleaf (*Abutilon theophrasti*). *Weed Sci.*, **36**, 751–7.
- Peet, M. M. (1986). Acclimation to high CO₂ in monoecious cucumbers. *Plant Physiol.*, **80**, 59–62.
- Peet, M. M., Huber, S. C. & Patterson, D. T. (1985). Acclimation to high CO₂ in monoecious cucumbers. II. Carbon exchange rates, enzyme activities and starch and nutrient concentrations. *Plant Physiol.*, **80**, 63–7.
- Phillips, D. A., Newell, K. D., Hassell, S. A. & Felling, C. E. (1976). The effect of CO₂ enrichment on root nodule development and symbiotic N₂ reduction in *Pisum sativum* L. *Amer. J. Bot.*, **63**, 356–62.
- Poorter, H. (1993). Interspecific variation in the growth response of plants to an elevated ambient CO₂ concentration. *Vegetatio*, **104/105**, 77–97.
- Poorter, H., Pot, S. & Lambers, H. (1988). The effect of an elevated atmospheric CO₂ concentration on growth, photosynthesis and respiration of *Plantago major*. *Physiol. Plant.*, **73**, 553–9.
- Potvin, C. (1985). Amelioration of chilling effects by CO₂ enrichment. *Physiol. Veg.*, **23**, 345–52.
- Potvin, C. & Strain, B. R. (1985). Effects of CO₂ enrichment and temperature on growth in two C₄ weeds, *Echinochloa crus-galli* and *Eleusine indica*. *Can. J. Bot.*, **63**, 1495–9.
- Prior, S. A. (1986). Field studies of the water relations and growth responses of soybean [*Glycine max* (L.) Merr. 'Bragg'] grown under different water regimes in CO₂-enriched atmospheres. MS thesis. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina.
- Prior, S. A. (1992). Cotton root response to free-air CO₂ enrichment. PhD dissertation, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.
- Prior, S. A. & Rogers, H. H. (1992). A portable soil coring system that minimizes plot disturbance. *Agron. J.*, **84**, 1073–7.
- Prior, S. A., Rogers, H. H., Sionit, N., & Patterson, R. P. (1991). Effects of elevated atmospheric CO₂ on water relations of soybean. *Agric. Ecosys. & Environ.*, **35**, 13–25.
- Prior, S. A., Rogers, H. H., Runion, G. B. & Mauney, J. R. (1993). Effects of free-air CO₂ enrichment on cotton root growth. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* (In press).
- Purohit, A. N. & Tregunna, E. B. (1976). Effects of carbon dioxide on the growth of Douglas-fir seedlings. *Ind. J. Plant Physiol.*, **19**, 164–70.
- Radin, J. W., Kimball, B. A., Hendrix, D. L. & Mauney, J. R. (1987). Photosynthesis of cotton plants exposed to elevated levels of carbon dioxide in the field. *Photosyn. Res.*, **12**, 191–203.
- Rallo, L. & del Rio, C. (1990). Effect of a CO₂-enriched environment on the rooting ability and carbohydrate level of olive cuttings. *Adv. Hort. Sci.*, **4**, 129–30.
- Reardon, J. C., Lambert, J. R. & Acock, B. (1990). The influence of carbon dioxide enrichment on the seasonal patterns of nitrogen fixation in soybeans. Series 016, Response of Vegetation to Carbon Dioxide, Joint program of DOE and USDA-ARS, Washington, DC, 94 pp.
- Reddy, V. R., Acock, B. & Acock, M. C. (1989a). Seasonal carbon and nitrogen accumulation in relation to net carbon dioxide exchange in a carbon dioxide-enriched soybean canopy. *Agron. J.*, **81**, 78–83.
- Reddy, V. R., Baker, D. N. & McKinion, J. M. (1989b). Analysis of effects of atmospheric carbon dioxide and ozone on cotton yield trends. *J. Environ. Qual.*, **18**, 427–32.

- Reuveni, J. & Gale, J. (1985). The effect of high levels of carbon dioxide on dark respiration and growth of plants. *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **8**, 623–8.
- Riechers, G. H. & Strain, B. R. (1988). Growth of blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*) in response to atmospheric CO₂ enrichment. *Can. J. Bot.*, **66**, 1570–3.
- Rogers, H. H. & Bottomley, P. A. (1987). *In situ* nuclear magnetic resonance imaging of roots: Influence of soil type, ferromagnetic particle content, and soil water. *Agron. J.*, **79**, 957–65.
- Rogers, H. H. & Dahlman, R. C. (1993). Crop responses to CO₂ enrichment. *Vegetatio*, **104/105**, 117–31.
- Rogers, H. H., Bingham, G. E., Cure, J. D., Smith, J. M. & Surano, K. A. (1983a). Responses of selected plant species to elevated carbon dioxide in the field. *J. Environ. Qual.*, **12**, 569–74.
- Rogers, H. H., Thomas, J. F. & Bingham, G. E. (1983b). Response of agronomic and forest species to elevated atmospheric carbon dioxide. *Science*, **220**, 428–9.
- Rogers, H. H., Sionit, N., Cure, J. D., Smith, J. M. & Bingham, G. E. (1984). Influence of elevated carbon dioxide on water relations of soybeans. *Plant Physiol.*, **74**, 233–8.
- Rogers, H. H., Cure, J. D. & Smith, J. M. (1986). Soybean growth and yield response to elevated carbon dioxide. *Agric. Ecosys. & Environ.*, **16**, 113–28.
- Rogers, H. H., Allen, L. H., Jr, Kimball, B. A., Idso, S. B., Miller, J. E., Rawlins, S. L. & Dahlman, R. C. (1992a). Testimony before Public Hearing ('Potential Impacts of Climate Change on Agricultural Production') of Committee of Enquiry on 'Protecting the Earth's Environment', 17–18 February, Enquete Kommission, Deutscher Bundestag, Bundeshaus, Bonn, Germany, 6 pp.
- Rogers, H. H., Peterson, C. M., McCrimmon, J. N. & Cure, J. D. (1992b). Response of plant roots to elevated atmospheric carbon dioxide. *Plant, Cell & Environ.*, **15**, 749–52.
- Rogers, H. H., Prior, S. A. & O'Neill, E. G. (1993). Cotton root and rhizosphere responses to free-air CO₂ enrichment. In *Free-air CO₂ Enrichment for Plant Research in the Field*, ed. G. R. Hendrey. CRC Press Inc., Boca Raton, Florida.
- Rosenberg, N. J., Kimball, B. A., Martin, P. & Cooper, C. F. (1990). From climate and CO₂ enrichment to evapotranspiration. In *Climate Change and US Water Resources*, ed. P. E. Waggoner. John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp. 151–75.
- Rowland-Bamford, A., Nordenbrock, C., Baker, J. T., Bowes, G. & Allen, L. H., Jr (1990). Changes in stomatal density in rice grown under various CO₂ regimes with natural solar irradiance. *Environ. Exp. Bot.*, **2**, 175–80.
- Rufty, T. W., Jr, Raper, C. D., Jr & Jackson, W. A. (1981). Nitrogen assimilation, root growth and whole plant responses of soybean to root temperature, and to carbon dioxide and light in the aerial environment. *New Phytol.*, **88**, 607–19.
- Rundel, P. W., Ehleringer, J. R. & Nagy, K. A. (eds) (1989). *Stable Isotopes in Ecological Research*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 525 pp.
- Runion, G. B., Curl, E. A., Rogers, H. H., Backman, P. A., Rodriguez-Kábana, R. & Helms, B. E. (1993). Effects of CO₂ enrichment on microbial populations in the rhizosphere and phyllosphere of cotton. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* (in press).
- Ryan, M. G. (1991). Effects of climate change on plant respiration. *Ecol. Appl.*, **1**, 157–67.
- Sage, R. F., Sharkey, T. D. & Seemann, J. R. (1989). Acclimation of photosynthesis to elevated CO₂ in five C₃ species. *Plant Physiol.*, **89**, 590–6.
- Sasek, T. W. & Strain, B. R. (1988). Effects of carbon dioxide enrichment on the growth and morphology of kudzu (*Pueraria lobata*). *Weed Sci.*, **36**, 28–36.
- Sasek, T. W. & Strain, B. R. (1989). Effects of carbon dioxide enrichment on the expansion and size of kudzu (*Pueraria lobata*) leaves. *Weed Sci.*, **37**, 23–8.
- Sasek, T. W. & Strain, B. R. (1990). Implications of atmospheric CO₂ enrichment and climatic change for the geographical distribution of two introduced vines in the USA. *Climatic Change*, **16**, 31–51.
- Sasek, T. W., DeLucia, E. H. & Strain, B. R. (1985). Reversibility of photosynthetic inhibition in cotton after long-term exposure to elevated CO₂ concentrations. *Plant Physiol.*, **78**, 619–22.
- Scheidegger, U. C. & Nösberger, J. (1984). Influence of carbon dioxide concentration on growth, carbohydrate content, translocation and photosynthesis of white clover. *Ann. Bot.*, **54**, 735–42.
- Schlesinger, W. H. (1991). *Biogeochemistry: An Analysis of Global Change*. Academic Press, New York, 443 pp.
- Schonfeld, M., Johnson, R. C. & Ferris, D. M. (1989). Development of winter wheat under increased atmospheric CO₂ and water limitation at tillering. *Crop Sci.*, **29**, 1083–6.
- Schwarz, M. & Gale, J. (1984). Growth response to salinity at high levels of carbon dioxide. *J. Exp. Bot.*, **35**, 193–6.
- Shivashankar, K. & Vlassak, K. (1978). Influence of straw and CO₂ on N₂-fixation and yield of field-grown soybeans. *Plant & Soil*, **49**, 259–66.
- Shivashankar, K., Vlassak, K. & Livens, J. (1976). A comparison of the effect of straw incorporation and CO₂ enrichment on the growth, nitrogen fixation and yield of soya beans. *J. Agric. Sci.*, **87**, 181–5.
- Shugart, H. H. & Emanuel, W. R. (1985). Carbon dioxide increase: The implications at the ecosystem level. *Plant Cell & Environ.*, **8**, 381–6.
- Sionit, N. (1983). Response of soybean to two levels of mineral nutrition in CO₂-enriched atmosphere. *Crop Sci.*, **23**, 329–33.
- Sionit, N., Hellmers, H. & Strain, B. R. (1980). Growth and yield of wheat under CO₂ enrichment and water stress. *Crop Sci.*, **20**, 687–90.
- Sionit, N., Mortensen, D. A., Strain, B. R. & Hellmers, H. (1981a). Growth response of wheat to CO₂ enrichment and different levels of mineral nutrition. *Agron. J.*, **73**, 1023–7.
- Sionit, N., Strain, B. R. & Beckford, H. A. (1981b). Environmental controls on the growth and yield of okra. I. Effects of temperature and of CO₂ enrichment at cool temperature. *Crop Sci.*, **21**, 885–8.
- Sionit, N., Strain, B. R. & Hellmers, H. (1981c). Effects of different concentrations of atmospheric CO₂ on growth and yield of wheat. *J. Agric. Sci.*, **79**, 335–9.
- Sionit, N., Strain, B. R., Hellmers, H. & Kramer, P. J. (1981d). Effects of atmospheric CO₂ concentrations and water stress on water relations of wheat. *Bot. Gaz.*, **142**, 191–6.
- Sionit, N., Hellmers, H. & Strain, B. R. (1982). Interaction of atmospheric CO₂ enrichment and irradiance on plant growth. *Agron. J.*, **74**, 721–5.
- Sionit, N., Rogers, H. H., Bingham, G. E. & Strain, B. R. (1984). Photosynthesis and stomatal conductance with CO₂-enrichment of container- and field-grown soybeans. *Agron. J.*, **76**, 447–51.
- Sionit, N., Strain, B. R., Hellmers, H., Riechers, G. H. & Jaeger, C. H. (1985). Long-term atmospheric CO₂ enrichment affects the growth and development of *Liquidambar styraciflua* and *Pinus taeda* seedlings. *Can. J. For. Res.*, **15**, 468–71.
- Sionit, N., Strain, B. R. & Flint, E. P. (1987). Interaction of temperature and CO₂ enrichment on soybean: Growth and dry matter partitioning. *Can. J. Plant Sci.*, **67**, 59–67.
- Smith, J. B. & Tirpak, D. A. (eds) (1989). *The Potential Effects of Global Climate Change on the United States. Appendix C—Agriculture, Vols. I & II*, EPA, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Washington, DC.
- Smith, S. D., Strain, B. R. & Sharkey, T. D. (1987). Effects of

- CO₂ enrichment on four Great Basin grasses. *Func. Ecol.*, **1**, 139–43.
- Sombroek W. G. (1990). Soils on a warmer earth: The tropical regions. In *Soils on a Warmer Earth*, ed. H. W. Scharpenseel, M. Schomaker & A. Ayoub. Elsevier Science Publishers, Amsterdam, pp. 157–74.
- Sritharan, R. & Lenz, F. (1990). The effect of CO₂ concentration and water supply on photosynthesis, dry matter production and nitrate concentrations of Kohlrabi (*Brassica oleracea* var. *gongylodes* L.). *Acta Hort.*, **268**, 43–54.
- St Omer, L. & Horvath, S. M. (1984). Developmental changes in anatomy, morphology and biochemistry of *Layia platyglossa* exposed to elevated carbon dioxide. *Amer. J. Bot.*, **71**, 693–9.
- Strain, B. R. (1987). Direct effects of increasing atmospheric CO₂ on plants and ecosystems. *Trend Ecol. Evol.*, **2**, 18–21.
- Strain, B. R. (1991). Available technologies for field experimentation with elevated CO₂ in global change research. In *Ecosystem Experiments*, ed. H. A. Mooney, E. Medina, D. W. Schindler, E. D. Schulze & B. H. Walker. SCOPE 45, John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp. 245–61.
- Strain, B. R. & Cure, J. D. (eds) (1985). Direct effects of increasing carbon dioxide on vegetation. DOE/ER-0238, Office of Energy Research, US Dept. of Energy, Washington, DC, 286 pp.
- Strain, B. R. & Cure, J. D. (1986). Direct effects of atmospheric CO₂ on plants and ecosystems: A bibliography with abstracts. ORNL/CDIC-13, US Dept. of Energy, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 1032 entries.
- Stulen, I. & den Hertog, J. (1993). Root growth and functioning under atmospheric CO₂ enrichment. *Vegetatio*, **104/105**, 99–115.
- Taiz, L. & Zeiger, E. (1991). *Plant Physiology*. The Benjamin/Cummings Pub. Co., Redwood City, California, 559 pp.
- Tans, P. P., Fung, I. Y. & Takahashi, T. (1990). Observational constraints on the global atmospheric budget. *Science*, **247**, 1431–8.
- Thomas, J. F. & Harvey, C. N. (1983). Leaf anatomy of four species grown under continuous CO₂ enrichment. *Bot. Gaz.*, **144**, 303–9.
- Thomas, R. B. & Strain, B. R. (1991). Root restriction as a factor in photosynthetic acclimation of cotton seedlings grown in elevated carbon dioxide. *Plant Physiol.*, **96**, 627–34.
- Thompson, G. B. (1990). The influence of CO₂ enrichment on the growth, nitrogen concentration, and mildew infection of cereals. PhD thesis. University of Cambridge, Cambridge, 140 pp.
- Thompson, G. B. & Drake, B. G. (1993). The insect infestation and fungal infection of a C₃ sedge and a C₄ grass are affected by elevated atmospheric CO₂ in open top chambers in the field. *Plant, Cell & Environ.* (submitted).
- Tinus, R. W. (1972). CO₂ enriched atmosphere speeds growth of ponderosa pine and blue spruce seedlings. *Tree Plant. Notes*, **23**, 12–15.
- Tissue, D. T. & Oechel, W. C. (1987). Response of *Eriophorum vaginatum* to elevated CO₂ and temperature in the Alaskan tussock tundra. *Ecol.*, **68**, 401–10.
- Tognoni, F., Halevy, A. H. & Wittwer, S. H. (1967). Growth of bean and tomato plants as affected by root absorbed growth substances and atmospheric carbon dioxide. *Planta*, **72**, 43–52.
- Tolley, L. C. & Strain, B. R. (1984a). Effects of CO₂ enrichment and water stress on growth of *Liquidambar styraciflua* and *Pinus taeda* seedlings. *Can. J. Bot.*, **62**, 2135–9.
- Tolley, L. C. & Strain, B. R. (1984b). Effects of CO₂ enrichment on growth of *Liquidambar styraciflua* and *Pinus taeda* seedlings under different irradiance levels. *Can. J. For. Res.*, **14**, 343–50.
- Van Veen, J. A., Liljeroth, E., Lekkerkerk, L. J. A. & Van de Geijn, S. C. (1991). Carbon fluxes in plant-soil systems at elevated atmospheric CO₂ levels. *Ecol. Appl.*, **1**, 175–81.
- Vancura, V. (1988). Plant metabolites in soil. In *Soil Microbial Associations*, ed. V. Vancura & F. Kunc. Elsevier Science Publishers, Amsterdam, pp. 57–144.
- Vessey, J. K., Henry, L. T. & Raper, C. D., Jr (1990). Nitrogen nutrition and temporal effects of enhanced carbon dioxide on soybean growth. *Crop Sci.*, **30**, 287–94.
- Vu, J. C. V., Allen, L. H., Jr & Bowes, G. (1989). Leaf ultrastructure, carbohydrates and protein of soybeans grown under CO₂ enrichment. *Environ. & Exp. Bot.*, **29**, 141–7.
- Warrick, R. A. (1988). Carbon dioxide, climatic change and agriculture. *The Geo. J.*, **154**, 221–33.
- Wheeler, R. M. & Tibbitts, T. W. (1989). Utilization of potatoes for life support systems in space. IV. Effect of CO₂ enrichment. *Amer. Potato J.*, **66**, 25–34.
- Wheeler, R. M., Tibbitts, T. W. & Fitzpatrick, A. H. (1991). Carbon dioxide effects on potato growth under different photoperiods and irradiance. *Crop Sci.*, **31**, 1209–13.
- Whipps, J. M. (1985). Effect of CO₂ concentration on growth, carbon distribution and loss of carbon from roots of maize. *J. Exp. Bot.*, **36**, 644–51.
- Whipps, J. M. (1990). Carbon economy. In *The Rhizosphere*, ed. J. M. Lynch. John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp. 59–97.
- Whipps, J. M. & Lynch, J. M. (1985). Energy losses by the plant in rhizodeposition. In *Plant Products and the New Technology*, ed. K. W. Fuller & J. R. Gallon. Annual Proceedings of the Phytochemical Society of Europe 26, Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp. 59–71.
- Whiting, G. J., Gandy, E. L. & Yoch, D. C. (1986). Tight coupling of root-associated nitrogen fixation and plant photosynthesis in the salt marsh grass *Spartina alterniflora* and carbon dioxide enhancement of nitrogenase activity. *Appl. & Environ. Microbiol.*, **52**, 108–13.
- Williams, L. E., DeJong, T. M. & Phillips, D. A. (1981). Carbon and nitrogen limitations on soybean seedling development. *Plant Physiol.*, **68**, 1206–9.
- Williams, W. E., Garbutt, K., Bazzaz, F. A. & Vitousek, P. M. (1986). The response of plants to elevated CO₂. IV. Two deciduous-forest tree communities. *Oecologia*, **69**, 454–9.
- Wilson, P. W., Fred, E. B. & Salmon, M. R. (1933). Relation between carbon dioxide and elemental nitrogen assimilation in leguminous plants. *Soil Sci.*, **35**, 145–63.
- Wittwer, S. H. (1966). Application of carbon dioxide for vegetable growing under glass or plastic. In *Proc. Conf. on Vegetable Growing Under Glass*, 31 May–4 June 1965, The Hague, the Netherlands, pp. 129–34.
- Wittwer, S. H. (1970). Aspects of CO₂ enrichment for crop production. *Trans. ASAE*, **13**, 249–51, 256.
- Wittwer, S. H. (1978). Carbon dioxide fertilization of crop plants. In *Problems in Crop Physiology*, ed. U. S. Gupta. Haryana Agric. Univ., Hissar, India, pp. 310–33.
- Wittwer, S. H. (1985). Carbon dioxide levels in the biosphere: Effects on plant productivity. *CRC Critical Reviews in Plant Science*, **2**, 171–98. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Wong, S. C. (1979). Elevated atmospheric partial pressure of CO₂ and plant growth. I. Interactions of nitrogen nutrition and photosynthetic capacity in C₃ and C₄ plants. *Oecologia*, **44**, 68–74.
- Wong, S. C. (1980). Effects of elevated partial pressures of CO₂ on rate of CO₂ assimilation and water use efficiency in plants. In *Carbon Dioxide and Climate: Australian Research*, ed. G. I. Pearman. Australian Academy of Science, Canberra, Australia, pp. 159–66.
- Wong, S. C. (1990). Elevated atmospheric partial pressure of CO₂ and plant growth. II. Non-structural carbohydrate content in cotton plants and its effect on growth parameters. *Photosyn. Res.*, **23**, 171–80.

- Wong, S. C. & Osmond, C. B. (1991). Elevated atmospheric partial pressure of CO₂ and plant growth. III. Interactions between *Triticum aestivum* (C₃) and *Echinochloa frumentacea* (C₄) during growth in mixed culture under different CO₂, N nutrition and irradiance treatments, with emphasis on below-ground responses estimates using $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ value of root biomass. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol.*, **18**, 137–52.
- Wood, C. W., Torbert, H. A., Rogers, H. H., Runion, G. B. & Prior, S. A. (1993). Free-air CO₂ enrichment on soil carbon and nitrogen. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* (in press).
- Woodward, F. I. (1987). Stomatal numbers are sensitive to increases in CO₂ from pre-industrial levels. *Nature*, **327**, 617.
- Woodward, F. I. & Bazzaz, F. A. (1988). The responses of stomatal density to CO₂ partial pressure. *J. Exp. Bot.*, **39**, 1771–81.
- Woodward, F. I., Thompson, G. B. & McKee, I. F. (1991). The effects of elevated concentrations of carbon dioxide on individual plants, populations, communities and ecosystems. *Ann. Bot.*, **67**, 23–38.
- Wray, S. M. & Strain, B. R. (1987a). Competition in old-field perennials under CO₂ enrichment. *Ecology*, **68**, 1116–20.
- Wray, S. M. & Strain, B. R. (1987b). Interaction of age and competition under CO₂ enrichment. *Func. Ecol.*, **1**, 147–9.
- Wulff, R. D. & Strain, B. R. (1982). Effects of CO₂ enrichment on growth and photosynthesis in *Desmodium paniculatum*. *Can. J. Bot.*, **60**, 1084–91.
- Wyse, R. (1980). Growth of sugar beet seedlings in various atmospheres of oxygen and carbon dioxide. *Crop Sci.*, **20**, 456–8.
- Yelle, S., Gosselin, A. & Trudel, M. J. (1987). Effect of atmospheric CO₂ concentration and root-zone temperature on growth, mineral nutrition, and nitrate reductase activity of greenhouse tomato. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.*, **112**, 1036–40.
- Yelle, S., Beeson, R. C., Jr, Trudel, M. J. & Gosselin, A. (1989). Acclimation of two tomato species to high atmospheric CO₂. I. Starch and sugar concentrations. *Plant Physiol.*, **90**, 1465–72.
- Zangerl, A. R. & Bazzaz, F. A. (1984). The response of plants to elevated CO₂. II. Competitive interactions between annual plants under varying light and nutrients. *Oecologia*, **62**, 412.
- Zeroni, M. & Gale, J. (1989). Response of 'Sonia' roses to salinity at three levels of ambient CO₂. *J. Hort. Sci.*, **64**, 503–11.

APPENDIX

Nomenclature of common and Latin names of plant species

Common name	Latin name
Alfalfa	<i>Medicago sativa</i>
Amaranthus	<i>Amaranthus</i> sp.
Aster	<i>Aster</i> sp.
Atlas cedar	<i>Cedrus atlantica</i>
Austrian pine	<i>Pinus nigra</i>
Broomsedge	<i>Andropogon virginicus</i>
Chrysanthemum	<i>Chrysanthemum morifolium</i>
Clover	<i>Trifolium</i> sp.
Corn	<i>Zea mays</i>
Cotton	<i>Gossypium hirsutum</i>
Curly dock	<i>Rumex crispus</i>
French bean	<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i>
Loblolly pine	<i>Pinus taeda</i>
Maize	<i>Zea mays</i>
Okra	<i>Hibiscus esculentus</i>
Orchard grass	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>
Pea	<i>Pisum sativum</i>
Peperomia	<i>Peperomia</i> sp.
Perennial rye grass	<i>Lolium perenne</i>
Pineapple	<i>Ananas comosus</i>
Potato	<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>
Radish	<i>Raphanus sativus</i>
Raspberry	<i>Rubus idaeus</i>
Rice	<i>Oryza sativa</i>
Shortleaf pine	<i>Pinus echinata</i>
Sorghum	<i>Sorghum vulgare</i>
Soybean	<i>Glycine max</i>
Sudan grass	<i>Sorghum sudanense</i>
Sugar beet	<i>Beta vulgaris</i>
Sugarcane	<i>Saccharum officinarum</i>
Sweet potato	<i>Ipomoea batatas</i>
Sweetgum	<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>
Tomato	<i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i>
Virginia pine	<i>Pinus virginiana</i>
Wheat	<i>Triticum aestivum</i>
White clover	<i>Trifolium repens</i>
White oak	<i>Quercus alba</i>
Winter wheat	<i>Triticum aestivum</i>
Yellow poplar	<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>